

THE
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.
1876

JANUARY, 1876.

ART. I.—THE EXTERNAL HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, LANCASTER, PA.

BY REV. C. Z. WEISER, D. D.

It is meet and right to make grateful acknowledgment of God's amiable and adorable Providence at all times. Especially do the angels of our better nature call to us, individually and collectively, in seasons of Festivity and Jubilee, loudly and earnestly :

"Walk about Zion, and go round about her: tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generations following."

Nor did this divine impulse fail to utter itself responsively, during all the ages, in signs and words of eulogy, history and song; in monumental deeds and memorial times. The *Vox Populi* interpreted and directed the *Vox Dei*.

The Jubilee is of God. It is His oracle in History. Let us ever pray for light, that we may rightly render it and divine its meaning. It tells of that which was, which is, and which is to come. It concentrates the Past, the Present, and the Future,

all in a focal monument, and stands for a symbol of the Divine Exhibition. The Jubilee is an Ethical Pyramid. It is an "Ebenezer," which the Samuels erect, and designates God and man's resting-place in Time—their Sabbatical season and station in History.

It is a "Bethel," too. The stone becomes an Altar, which speaks of conflict and struggle, of sacrifice and victory, of benediction and thanksgiving.

And, again, it becomes a "Jehovah-Nissi," a Heavenly Banner for the forces of Israel to advance under.

Thus we see in the Jubilee of to-day a monument of the Past, an inspiration of the Present, and a Prophecy of the Future.

Israel oriented itself in the "Year of Jubilee" like an eagle. It passed the days of yore under joyful review. It proudly surveyed its later acquired proportions and advanced strides. It laid hold afresh on the promised inheritance.

The Reformed Church in the United States piously projected and is joyfully consummating its *Semi-Centennial Seminarian Jubilee*. By the dim shadow of by-gone years, we would learn thankfully to bathe in the fairer light of the day that has dawned, and to hopefully hail the glory that is to come. We would be the better for our Festive Service, as well.

Let us sing a *Magnificat* over the days of yore, and their doings. Let us invoke a *Benedictus* upon the blossoms and fruits of to-day. Then will the *Gloria Patri* not fail to ascend in the time that shall be.

Throughout the Historical Books of the Old Testament frequent reference is had to the "Schools of the Prophets." They were the primitive beginnings of Religious Training-Houses, of Educational Colleges, and Theological Seminaries, in God's ancient Israel. Therein a Priest or Levite dispensed tuition to a few scholars attracted around him by a pious affinity, in the earliest times. The school was a nursery, and the pupils were as children under a fatherly spirit.

Thus humble, in origin and character, were the Jewish Seminaries.

Soon the "Rabbi" became prominent. The Prophet Samuel presently stood forth, as the founder of Hebrew Schools. Ramah, Bethel, Jericho, Gilgal, and still other localities are known and honored as educational quarters of this order. And once established, we need not wonder that they continued to survive down to the close of the ancient Canon and Advent of Christ. Was it not destined that the Race "should be taught of God?"

The inner life of the ancient Hebrew Seminary was of a heavenly simplicity. At its head stood the kindly master, a truly venerable and saintly man of God. The scholars were young men, poor and humble, but promising and devout. Elisha quitted the plow. Amos had been a herdsman and gatherer of sycamore fruit. The lot and lineage of God's servants ever had this common mark—"that they were of no reputation."

The School of the Prophets was a community. The inmates erected their simple homes of trees, felled by their own diligent hands. Their habit and fare bespoke ardor and self-denial. Their garments were skins, sack-cloth and hair-shirts. Bread and honey were their daily food.

Their study was the Law—its interpretation and application.

There, and under such a discipline, were trained the ministers of Israel—they, whom St. Augustin calls, "the philosophers, divines, instructors, and guardians of Hebrew virtue and piety."

The Christian Church is the School of Jesus. Christians were first called "Disciples"—*Learners*. God is light, and the Kingdom of His Son is His Shechinah on Earth. The primal edict was: "*Let there be light!*"—and the standing response issues from the lips of the Divine Founder—"I am the Light of the world!"

The Church of God is one, though of a twofold Dispensation. The Patriarchs walked in a heavenly halo, never wandering,

though never knowing whither they went. The Prophets were Sages. The Psalmists were Seers. The Kings of Israel were illuminated Monarchs. The Apostles were reservoirs of unearthly lore. The Evangelists framed Holy Records, in which the empire of Science discovers no flaw. The Letters of Paul and his companions are classic Epistles. The Writings of the Apostolic Fathers withstand the tooth of time. The Church Fathers and Saintly Doctors are as light-towers along the shores of the ages. The Monks were Savants. Popes, Bishops and Ministers were never imbeciles, whatever else was charged against them. The Clergy constitutes the sole Profession that has ever been accused of *monopolizing Learning*. This is significant in every view, and especially pertinent to our argument.

The Christian Church has civilized the Nations, and covered the land with Educational Institutions. The Great Teacher founded a "College of Apostles." The Schools at Alexandria, Carthage, Rome, and in numberless other quarters, were fountains of sanctified wisdom to an infantile civilization. The Universities on and off the European Continent are all the daughters of the Church, and from the day in which Christ subjected Cæsar cease not silently but eloquently to shed abroad the light of Heaven.

The Seminaries in the New World are no less the direct offspring of the Church. Until the founding of Girard College and the day of Normal Schools, Christianity built and manned the Educational machinery of America. The Temple and the School-House rose together on the Western Continent, and the Pastor and the Schoolmaster were cousin-germain. The University at Cambridge (Harvard) was founded in 1636; the College of William and Mary, in 1689; the School at New Haven, in 1700; Nassau Hall, in 1738—all products of an ecclesiastical leaven. And we rest the case with these few specimens.

The first Seminary, under the auspices of Germanic Christianity, was founded at Hartwick, N. Y., in 1790. Negotiation

was had already in 1787 for a German Christian School, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Many barriers confronted the project, and delayed its consummation for a whole generation. In 1825 a new inspiration moved the German masses, and—but, we anticipate!

The migration of the Reformed Church westward, its planting and first beginning in American soil, may no longer be definitely told. It is manifestly safe, however, to fix the date no later than 1725. Whilst legend and tradition would persuade us to antedate the epoch by many years, by a full century, indeed, a consideration of modesty might move us to place it later. We heed neither voice, then, but rely wholly on the series of facts and incidents which history renders patent:—

Hollanders, Germans, Palatinates, Swedes and Swiss—these were among the first white settlers in South America and the East and West India Isles, in Louisiana and Georgia, in the Carolinas, in the Provinces of Maine, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. There is hardly a State in the Union in which patronymics and local names do not reveal an early migration of the Teutonic forefathers. The first German colony located at Venezuela in 1526, under Ambrosius Alfinger, of Ulm. Philip von Hutten sailed with a squad of his countrymen for South America, in 1541. It falls upon the ear as a fabulous tale, to speak of pioneer Germans along the Pacific coast, the territory of Mexico, and the lesser Isles; and yet, not a few families in these and contiguous regions trace their lineage to a Germanic parentage, that emigrated prior to the "Thirty Years' War." The German element became one with the New World from its first re-discovery through Martin Behaim, in 1482, and maintained its living connection by means of an unbroken immigration and ceaseless founding of settlements in all quarters of our country's domain, down to the present day. The Bahama Isles perpetuate the name of Martin Behaim. The States of New York and Pennsylvania were first

known as Weinland. Throughout the States we find cities, towns and districts which tell of their original founders, such as "Palatine," "Rheinbeck," "Germantown," the "German Flats," "Hagerstown," "Newberg," "Wurtemberg," "Bern," "Johnstown," and many others. The island on which New York City stands was purchased from the Manhattan Indians in 1613, for *twenty-four Dutch Thalers*. A church was organized there in 1619, by the Hollanders, which preserved its roll of membership since 1622. In the Province of Pennsylvania and Delaware we have still alive some reminiscences of early Germans. *Peter Minuit*, a German Reformed deacon of Wesel, founded a colony on the Delaware in 1638. He was the first Governor of New Amsterdam (New York) in 1626. *Blakenburg* and *Frey* preceded Governor Penn in 1680. In 1683-4, several ship-loads of Hollanders and Germans landed here. *John Koster* prayed for his naturalization and that of *one hundred and fifty High Germans*, in 1707. Their prayer was based on the very reasonable ground of having resided here since 1685. In 1710, already, at least one-third of the unhappy twenty-one thousand Germans, who had been misled by the benevolent but mistaken Queen Ann, landed on these shores. James Logan, the Provincial Secretary, writes, in 1717:—"A large number of Palatinates has settled here of late." Jonathan Dickinson, Logan's successor in office, says, in 1719:—"We daily expect from five to six thousand Palatinates." * * "Five years ago a multitude had come among us." All along the Hudson we find their monuments, in the names of towns and villages, which only the partial annalist and historian can ignore. In Pennsylvania the influx of our German forefathers indented itself during the interval between 1709 to 1723. In 1731, the Reformed Germans had reached the number of fifteen thousand.

The Reverend Jedediah Andrews, one of the six patriarchal Presbyterian Pastors in Philadelphia writes, in 1830:—"There is besides, in this Province, a vast number of Palatinates, and they come in still every year. Those that have come of late

years, are mostly Presbyterians, or as they call themselves, *Reformed*: the Palatinates being about *three-fifths* of that sort of people. * * * They never had a minister till about nine years ago,—i. e., 1721—who is a bright young man, and a fine scholar. He is at present absent, being gone to Holland to get money to build a church in this city; but they are scattered all over the country."

The same disinterested divine tells us, under the same date, this fact:—"There is lately come over a Palatinate candidate of the ministry, who, having applied to us at the Synod for ordination," etc. In 1727 Pastor George Michael Weiss appears on shore with four hundred Palatinates. This must have been his second advent, or Pastor Andrews would not speak of him in 1730, as having come "about nine years ago." Until we know to the contrary, we cannot concede the commonly-accepted opinion, that the enrollment of "G. M. Weiss, V. D. M.," as it stands in the list of Palatinates who arrived in 1727, marks his *first* arrival in America.

These facts warrants us to fix so early a date to the planting of the Reformed Church in the New World, and leave us a margin. Spare as they appear, they are timely and significant. The wonder is that they have not been made to speak out before to-day. Let us no longer ignore them, since they afford us a sure basis to make a beginning to our incipient history. They are above all suspicion and caption, too, coming as they do, from foreign sources and impartial hands.

But their confirmation, if any were needed, appears at hand in our *internal* history. We will note but a few corroborating circumstances.

At the first Convention of German Reformed Clergymen, in Philadelphia, in 1746, some of the few pioneer pastors in attendance revealed the fact, that they had lived and labored here for more than twenty years already. This sole revelation conducts us up and back to our assigned date, and establishes our chronology.

But consider, besides, the simultaneous rise of some thirteen.

Reformed Congregations within the territory of Eastern Pennsylvania, prior to the year 1730. From this date a record is at hand. The Church Register at New Goshenhoppen speaks of forty-nine heads of families, in the congregation, in 1730. It mentions the congregations of Old Goshenhoppen, Skippack, Oley, Swamp, Saucon, Egypt, Macedonia, Masillon, Bern, and Tulpehocken. Were the records preserved, the same might doubtless be predicated of the churches at Reading, Germantown, Lancaster, Philadelphia, and in still other like ancient places.

The German Palatinates began their emigration hitherward already in 1708. They antedate the Scotch-Irish by eleven years. The larger portion of this influx did not hold to the peace societies, such as the Amish, Tunkers, and Mennonites, but were principally of the liberal Reformed and Lutheran Churches.

Place our severally-noted incidents and facts, which have a meaning already in their isolated and independent relations, side by side, and we need not fear the charge of having done violence to history, or of having added to the years of the Reformed Church's existence in the United States. Yea, we will rather see that this is a Jubilee, indeed, in more than one sense. It will rejoice us all to know, that whilst we celebrate a Quinquagesimal Anniversary of the First Reformed Theological Seminary, immediately and directly, we, along with it, commemorate also the Origin and Planting of the Reformed Church in America—one hundred and fifty years ago.

These three significant dates confront our eyes:—

Anno Domini, 1725 ; Anno Domini, 1825 ; Anno Domini, 1875.

Es ist Eine Halbhundert und Eine Anderthalbhundert Feier.

For the history of the Reformed Church in the United States, from 1725 to 1750, we must rely principally on the Report of Superintendent Michael Schlatter prepared for the Synod of

Holland, in 1751. This ancient document enrolls the following Charges:—

Goshenhoppen and Great Swamp.—The Pastorate of George Michael Weiss, since 1746.

Philadelphia and Germantown.—Schlatter's Parish since 1747.

Falkoner Swamp and Providence.—The Charge of John Philip Leydich, since 1748.

Skippack, Whitpain, Indian Creek and Tohickon.—Vacant.

Lancaster and Schaffer's Church.—The former, vacant, the latter, served by Pastor Rieger.

Tulpehocken.—The Pastoral Field of Dominicus Bartholomæus, since 1748.

Yorktown, Cross Church, Conowago, Bramutschy.—A Circuit in which Jacob Lischy moved.

Weisseichenland, Modecreek, Cocalico, Sellenreich.—Anxious for a Pastor.

Donegal, Schwatara, Quihehill.—Vacant and Anxious.

Northampton and Southampton.—This Charge has been served since 1751 by Pastor Du Bois—a Hollander.

Great Lehigh, Little Lehigh, Forks, Delaware, Saucon and Springfield.—A Vacant Territory.

Heidelberg, Egypt and Jordan.—Vacant.

Macungie, Allemäugel, Schmalzgoss and Mazatany.—A Field crying for a Shepherd.

In Virginia, the Congregations in *Shanandoah, Misanotti, South Branch and New Germantown.*—These Points have been vacant for many years.

In Maryland, the Churches at *Monocacy and Canagotschy* are not regularly waited on.

In New Jersey, the Congregations at *Racheny and Foxhill* are vacant and anxious for a Pastor.

It is on record, that the Missionary Superintendent Schlatter, sailed from Amsterdam, June 1, 1746, and landed in Boston, August 1; that he came to Philadelphia on the 6th of September,

and was gladly welcomed by the Reformed Faithful; that he visited the Reformed Pastors scattered over Eastern Pennsylvania—four in number; that he convened the Pastors in Philadelphia, on the 12th of October, in friendly Conference, viz:—Boehm, Weiss, Rieger—Dortzius representing himself by letter; that Schlatter called the first COETUS in Philadelphia, on September 29, 1747, which was composed of thirty-one members; that the Pastors, Dominicus Bartholomeus, John Jacob Hochreutiner and John Philip Leydich arrived in 1748; that John Conrad Steiner came in 1749; that a Coetus was held annually; that Schlatter was sent to Holland for men and means; and that the Reformed Church in the United States embraced, in 1750, forty-six *Congregations*, sixteen *Pastoral Charges*, and five Stationed Pastors, who regularly served twelve Congregations and with the aid of Licentiates and Evangelists, supplied the wants of some *thirty-four* vacant fields by visitation, once and twice a year.

Besides, the territory of the Church spread over the Provinces of Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, Virginia, and further still, during her incipient age, and presents herself to the eye as a *Missionary Church* in the New World. No one would expect great results from her days of small things.

During the succeeding quarter of a century, by means of Schlatter's exertions at home and abroad, a new complexion was given to her face. Organization fruited happily and the Ministry multiplied. A general harvest seemed to open for this oldest daughter of the Reformation.

But between 1725 and 1825, there seems to lie one full century all fallow. A church without a Seminary for the long, round period of one hundred years—this is a mysterious fact. And the mystery is enhanced by the consideration, that the actual organization of the Reformed COETUS, in 1747, preceded the founding of the Theological School, in 1825, by nearly four-score years. A circle without a center for seventy-eight years! Surely this is anomalous. Moreover, the COETUS be-

comes a SYNOD—the Branch, a Tree—in 1793, but still no Church School for one generation following. Verily, Sarah may again smile over a late maternity; not for joy, but from a sense of mortification and feeling of silliness, rather. A child is born of a centennial mother. A generation is effected by an organization of eighty years' standing. A tree grows, buds and blossoms through thirty-two years, ere there is a fruiting. A century of life and activity; four-score years of organized being; thirty-two years of independent history—and only then a Theological Seminary!

Nor do we lay the blame for such tardiness upon our Pioneer Pastors and their successors. They, of fragrant memory, were scholarly divines. Just this, indeed, shades the labyrinth darker still, instead of extending us an Aladdin lamp. The Primitive Reformed Clergy were neither indifferentists nor fanatics; but men theologically and classically qualified for the ministry.

Here are some of them—

“How sweet their memories still:—”

JOHN HENRY GÖTSCHUS from the Canton of Zurich—Zwingli's home, the father of Church-Registers in the American Reformed Church, if not the Proto-Pastor—a noble, educated Swiss;

There was GEORGE MICHAEL WEISS, V. D. M., a Palatine, and student of Heidelberg; the first Agent of men, means and books for the Reformed Church in America, and though dead, he speaks even yet from his humble tomb at Goshenhoppen;

There was JOHN PETER MILLER, of whom our Presbyterian Pastor Andrews, speaks thus: “He is an extraordinary man for sense and learning. We gave him a question to discuss about Justification, and he answered it on a whole sheet of paper in a very remarkable manner. * * * * He speaks

Latin as readily as we do our vernacular. And so does the other—Mr. Weiss ;”

There was JOHN PHILIP BÖHM, a professionally trained Pedagogue, who became immortal as a pious and efficient Pastor ;

And JOHN BARTHOLOMY RIEGER came hither, titled both as a divine and as a physician ;

And who does not remember MICHAEL SCHLATTER, whose familiar face beams with life and light from the walls of many Reformed households ? The Vicar-General of the Primitive American Church Reformed—the Christian philanthropist, who loved his race regardless of circumstances and color—the benefactor to his kindred in Nation and Creed—the founder of Parochial Free Schools, and the Patriot to his adopted country ; And there was Schlatter's band of six : *Otterbein, Stoy, Waldemuth, Frankenfeld, Missler, and Rubel.* Bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, hails and mourns alike over Otterbein's demise in this strain : “Great and good man of God ! An honor to his Church and country ! One of the greatest scholars and divines that ever came to America, or were born in it !”

And let us but mention *Weyberg, Bucher, Hendel, Gobrecht, Faber, Wack, Steiner, Helfenstein, Pomp, Alsentz, Blumer, Helfrich, Vondersloot, Hinsch, Weiler.*

And, besides these, there were many more whom God knows, if we, their children, have forgotten them. Scholars, patriots, soldiers and Christian Pastors were they in very trying days, casting a luster over every station, and comparing very favorably with a like class of to-day, and counted out of any Denomination.

It were difficult to find an American Church, where the primitive ministry stood on a more elevated plain than the early Pastors of the Germanic Churches occupied. Titles of honor were not seldom conferred upon our German Missionary and Country Pastors. The students of Harvard University won-

dered at their fluency in the foreign tongues. Some were called to chairs of ancient languages. Between 1745 and 1770, no less than fifty German Clergymen lived and labored in the American Churches, Reformed and Lutheran, who had been liberally educated in German Universities.

As still further evidence on this general thought, we here record afresh:

"A Latin Letter from the Reformed Clergy to Governor Morris—A. D., 1754."

VIR AMPLISSIME !

Gratulamur nobis et tibi ; qui providò et propitiò numine Rege nostro clementissimo ordinante optimus Gubernatio ex Anglia salvus et incolumis nobis ad veneris.

Deus T. O. M. tuis benedicat functionibus ut trito jucunde et feliciter praesse nobis et prodere possis.

Hoc, Vir amplissimi, ut sinceriter Tibi et nobis ad precemur, Religio, quam proptemur, nos docet et officium, quo obstruigimur, á nobis requisit, set quot quot nomina inbrignavimus ministri Evangelii Jesu Christi castra sequimur Ecclesiae ut credimus orthodoxae, vulgo dictae Reformatae, quae per Hollandiam, Angliam, Helvetiam, Palatinum, eli, fundata et stabilita, est quod nobis non monentibus prò tua sesum publicarum cognitione ex actis Imperii Germanici, et aliorumque Europae Statuum, ipse facile nosti. Doctrinae et Disciplinæ hujus Ecclesiae á pueris imbuti, innutriti, formati, Deo et proximo devoti, patrio solò relicto, desiderati, vocati, mini omnes, quotquot audire nos amant, præprimis Germanos, quorum maximus numerus per omnes Pennsylvaniae Comitatus dispersus habitat, sanioribus Protestantismi Principiis ex Bibliis Sacris Symbolis authenticis, imbuere debemus, ut omnes cujusumque sortis et conditionis pro modulo capacitatis viribusque divinitus concessis officiò nominis, civis et Christiani intelligere et adimplere discant, ut hoc modò Deum timentes, Regem honorantes, proximum amantes tranquillam et pœatum ritam

invicem agentes posthac siamus participes melioris illius vitæ
cujus author est Jesus Christus benedictus in secula.

Vere Christiana Religio liceat nobis, Vir amplissime hoc
addere, vinculum societ; civil: non solvit sea majis neetit,
corpora civilia non turbat, sed pœat, non sanciat, red sanat
uno verba; pietas Regna pimat.

Ergo, Vir Amplissimes, ut nobis officio hoc nostro in nobilis-
simum Catholicum hunc finem porro puncturis, mascule et
benigniter fovens adsistasque illa una parrberia, quæ ministro
Evangelii J. Christi docet, submisce, enixe rogamus.

Nos vir amplissime in Deo Patre Luminum; per Jesum
Christum nobis conciliato.

In testimonium devoti nostri animi unanimi consensu, nomi-
natim nos suscribimus.

Tuæ Amplitudinis,

Deditissimi et Numillimi Servi.

Philadelphia, November 2d, 1754.

John Waldsmith, Cocalico.

Theodor Frankenfeld, Fredricktown.

Jonathan Du Bois, Northampton.

Conrad Templeman, Swatara.

Conrad Steiner, Germantown.

Michael Schlatter, Philadelphia.

John Bartholomy Rieger, Lancaster.

George Michael Weiss, Goshenhoppen.

John Philip Leydich, New Hanover.

Jacob Lischy, Yorktown.

P. W. Otterbein, Lancaster.

Henry Willh. Stoy, Tulpihokin.

Whatever errors the scholar of to-day may detect in the
Clerical Epistle, above given, they evidently fall home upon
the scribe and compositor. As a piece of early literature, it
speaks well for the status of our Reformed Pastors, during the
period of its composition.

THE SYNOD OF HOLLAND

must never be ignored in our effort to solve the problem of tardiness, in founding a Theological Seminary. The primitive and later ministry of the German Reformed Church was not after the order of Melchisedech, without father or mother; but of direct Levitical lineage. From 1725 down to 1793—for three-score years and ten, the venerable Synod of Holland merits the endearing title of Mother-Parturient and Foster-mother. Under its kindly auspices, the Dutch East and West India Company became a remarkable agency of Providence, in the work of Civilization and Christianity. This body of enterprising citizens and brave men from Amsterdam, moved by the spirit of honorable gain and Christian philanthropy, carried our primal forefathers and proto Pastors hither in ships. Thus a Commercial Institution became also a Religious Propaganda. Their Barks were the Holland 'Mayflowers,' as it were. A charity fund opened beyond the Seas and overflowed into the heart of the infantile, and dependent Church Reformed in the New World. The Classis of Amsterdam was made the Almoner *ad res Pennsylvanienses*, and through its instrumentality the Reformed COETUS, gladly gathered under the Ægis of the Mother Synod, after a nursing of a quarter of a century—from 1725 to 1747.

This union, once effected, continued well-nigh one-half century—from 1747 to 1793. As the Colonies derived their existence and sustenance from Mother England; as nearly all the American Churches deferred to their trans-Atlantic parents, so did the early German Reformed Church in the New World draw its mother-milk from her Hollandic *Alma Mater*. Men and means were freely proffered, and for one-half century, God thus joined together mother and child, the former shielding and providing for the other, so that there seemed to be no call or necessity for the younger to forestall the elder—no challenge to do for herself, so long as the period of her non-age should endure, save to love and obey her Guardian Angel of God.

As the age of her majority drew near, a certain restlessness evinced itself. The prelude to her independency became manifest and audible, in the proceedings of Conventions and annual Assemblies.

After nearly forty years of legal deference and submission to parental discipline, like in another and elder Israel, spies were sent in advance to peer into and report on the promised land of self-existence and independency. In 1785, eight years before the Dissolution, at the Synod of Reading, Pastor *John Henry Helfrich*, struck the first and tonic note to the founding of a Seminary for the American Reformed Church. Let this truly worthy and working Father's name be honorably and gratefully mentioned on this festive occasion. He matured, and presented a plan, with a view of conciliating the Synod of Holland.

But it is hard to sever a bond of union, whether in Church or State relations. The COETUS disapproved of the movement, as not necessary, and as opposed to the true interests of the Reformed German Churches. Its impracticability was also urged on the ground of the magnitude of the undertaking, and the great expense attending it.

Here, as in other Denominations, then, a collision came to the surface. Two parties fell in ranks and files—The COETUS and SYNOD men.

In 1787, two years later, the educational spirit covered a wider territory. The Religio-Germanic element sought for, and obtained from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, the charter for Franklin College, a movement endorsed by, and named after Doctor Benjamin Franklin. Here is the Act:

"Inasmuch as our German-born citizens have contributed so largely to the welfare and prosperity of the commonwealth, by means of their diligence, economy, and public virtue,

"*Resolved*, That a charter be granted to the said institution, for the training of their youth in the German, English, Latin and Greek languages."

Six years later, in the year 1793, on April 30th, in the City of Lancaster, the era of Independency dawned. The "branch" had grown on the main trunk for one half century. Then, like the Banyan, it sent down its hardy limb, took root in the new soil, and became self-existent. The COETUS, of the Classis of Amsterdam and Synod of Holland, was metamorphosed into "The Synod of the High German Reformed Church in the United States."

But why was the dissolution now? All unions end, sooner or later. It is a fatality which attends all things. The intimate oneness subsisting between the tree and its fruit is broken when the season of ripeness comes. Then the apple falls naturally.

Revolutions and tumults also effect disruptions. The War of Independence; the French Reign of Terror, with its hellish train; the blight of Rationalism on the Continent,—these were the words of severance.

It is only now, that necessity is laid on us to account for the tardiness on the part of the Reformed Church, in the founding of a Theological Seminary. During her minority, the Parent cared for her wants. But her majority having been reached, we must endeavor to report the reason of another full generation's delay.

It is sometimes thought that the dissolution of '93 was at once followed by a marked ecclesiastical degeneration. We cannot learn of any such violent subsidence. It cannot be proven that the ramparts and bulwarks which a European discipline had cast about the Holy Office, to guard it against the intrusion of imbeciles and impostors, suddenly melted away, like banks of snow, and that the Pulpits, Altars and Sanctuaries were quickly peopled by a race of ordinaries, fanatics and Landläufers.

The statutes embodied in the Organic Act show how base and baseless the charge is. The Ministry of the Divine Word was made to embrace three Orders:—The *Pastor*, the *Licentiate*, the *Catechist*.

THE PASTOR

must be a scholar, according to the spirit of the Instrument. All foreign clergymen were presumed to be of Academic or University culture, like their predecessors.

Candidates, whether from home or abroad, were required to be learned in the original tongues of the Old and New Testaments; equipped with credentials of some acknowledged Theological Faculty. And when such prerequisites were wanting an Examination in the Science of Theology, and a Homiletic test were to be passed before the Synod *pro Ministerio*.

THE LICENTIATE

was created and assigned a status, by the Synod of York, in 1800, by certain Acts of *Addenda*. He was held to be an embryonic Pastor, solidifying his lore, and serving as a practitioner, under the eye of the regular clergy, with a view of promotion to the ranks of the Ministry proper, after three years' probation. He was obliged to defer to his Superiors and Guardians, and annually to show a margin, lest his prerogatives should be shorn. Only after such a prolonged apprenticeship, could he attain to Ordination.

THE CATECHIST

stood on the nethermost round in the ladder. He might preach, exhort, and instruct, after full proof of proper qualification and good intention. He was, likewise, a creation of the Synod at York. A Board of Guardians presided over him and his work. His acts were consummated by Baptism, Confirmation and the Holy Communion through his superiors. He was no less obliged annually to report, and *nemine contradicenti*, obtained the prize.

Not every applicant grew into a Catechist. Not every Catechist became a Licentiate. Not every Licentiate fruited in a Pastor. The Acts of the Fathers, prior to the Founding of a

Seminary, strike us as rigorous and severe indeed. Not a few men, who subsequently became active and prominent Pastors, were subjected to an ecclesiastical inquisition, ere they gained a station on the walls of Zion. This one's character was spotted; another was found deficient in the knowledge of the Ancient Languages; a third was kindly advised to a further prosecution of his studies; and still another recedes altogether from view. "Lay hands suddenly on no man," was a rule, as well among the Fathers of the Reformed Church in the United States, as with the Apostles of old.

So, then, the way to the Pulpit and Altar was not made broad and easy, but gradual, strait and difficult. Indifference and laxity cannot be charged home upon the Fathers of the Ante-Seminarian period. Place the primitive and modern regulations side by side, and "we feel, in short, that *we* have descended to an inferior race; that it is with us, somewhat as if a nest of eagles had been filled with a brood of owls." And when this ancient order was modified by the Synod of Lancaster, in 1819, Pastor Samuel Helfenstein took good care to substitute such Rubrics as to still render the ascent to the walls of Zion far from easy.

But the question becomes all the more interesting and pressing, from all that has now been said—yea, painful, indeed,—

Why the mellow horn
Should chide so long the tardy-gaited morn?

The anomalous fact, that a full generation should have elapsed, between the Independence of the German Reformed Church, and the Founding of the Theological Seminary, finds a partial solution, at least, in a *series of circumstances* which we may now briefly note.

They are:—*A Chaotic Emigration; A Helpless Poverty; A Continual Warfare at Home and Abroad; A Ferocious Love of Liberty; A Despotism of Ignorance; A Retarding Influence of Clannish Isolation.*

I.

The pioneer emigrants of the Germanic wing of the Christian Church, were simply masses; hordes, promiscuous, variegated and heterogeneous. They were not Colonies, as were the Moravians, Huguenots, Puritans and Roman Catholics. Theirs was a swarming without a Queen, an Exodus without a Moses. They wandered, and wandering scattered, by a certain instinct, along rural districts, valleys, oases and streams.

Thus Muhlenberg, Schlatter and Zinzendorf found them; and thus they were obliged to leave them, too. They were, besides, human tidal waves of religious antipodes—Theists, Deists, Atheists, Naturalists, Rationalists, Infidels. Wanting in a plastic power, the master-builders of those times failed to infuse an *es-pirit-de-corps*. With sickened hearts and hope deferred, they died. Amid such an *omniversity*, how could there rise a university? Whilst the English settlers were already germs of compacts and original States, our ancestors were but hardly in a tribal condition.

II.

Our Germanic ancestry was an impoverished multitude. They were pauper settlers rather than squatter sovereigns. Without means and indebted even, the pioneers toiled like slaves for a bare living. How hard was the lot of the *Redemptioners*! Their Log-huts, Log-School-Houses and Log-Churches—these were a tax grievous to be borne. In these western wilds, with “families of nine and one at the breast,” can we look for a margin on which to calculate an Institution? Not a Harvard stood in all that line; nor an Elihu Yale; nor a Belcher. Not one—not five hundred—not the entire multitude could have founded and carried a Literary Institution.

III.

The pioneer and Colonial life of our forefathers was an unbroken history of anxiety. The elements were against them—

natural, national and social. The cruelty of the Indians; the perfidy of the English; the political and religious revolutions in the Fatherland—all were adverse. Society had nowhere come to a quiet. Like the early Christians, they were pilgrims and fugitives, and in jeopardy every hour. From the date of the earliest settlement in East Pennsylvania to within a few years of the Revolution, there was one continual conflict. The history of the Tulpehocken massacres, as well as of kindred carnages, has never been written. The deeds of valor, self-denial and heroism should be exhumed. The territory from Reading east and west, north and south, was patrolled by rangers, who subsequently were of Washington's most efficient soldiers. Ere we can judge them for not accomplishing more, we must endeavor to know the hardships and trials they actually surmounted.

War bears ever hardest on the poor. Our fathers thought themselves blessed in earning their daily bread and possessing their homely dwellings. They anticipated nothing more, least of all the founding of Colleges. Poverty, dispersion and impending outbreaks of carnage and warfare—these quench all literary aspirations.

IV.

Our forefathers were afflicted by a Liberty-mania. Despotism and tyranny of chronic standing breed this pestilence, which destroys the Nations. Freedom is a glorious means; but as an end, it is slavery once more. This is a paradox of social science. "Too far East is West," and so, too, Liberty becomes Libertinism.

Sons of thralldom as they had been, they were rapidly metamorphosed into Libertines, and confounded the privilege of doing right, with the sad lawlessness of doing as they pleased. From imperialism they plunged into individualism. A fearful tornado of licentiousness ensued. Poor Schlatter was swept away by it, because he aimed at the establishing of authority, law and order. Every effort at organization fell under suspi-

cion. Though Parochial Schools were established in a number of Parishes, this was the work of the Clergy exclusively. The ideal of an Institution so dearly cherished by the Superintendent, never met with sympathy or support. And so Michael Schlatter, even, lost heart and preferred a Cæsar under God, over a Church without authority. He chose one Master rather than the many. This it was, we candidly suspect, that turned the minister of peace into a minister of war—more than all else. This *virus* poisoned the minds of the early masses, and the sour grapes which the fathers ate still continue to set their children's teeth on edge. And this did its share towards delaying the consummation of organization and an Institution.

V.

The enchantment of Learning is wonderful in the eyes of the ignorant. The marvels of the Arabian Nights hardly impress our children's minds more strangely than do the visions of Gymnasiums, Colleges and Universities strike the masses.

Now, our early ancestors had seen all this paraphernalia of Science in the Fatherland in its greatest glory. But only did they know it as the creation and product of Government. How should the *populace* produce a University? As well hope for an elephant to spring from a mouse. A superstitious reverence cherished towards such an enterprise, did more for its delay and prevention, than any feeling of contempt for it. The undertaking seems far too herculean. The union of the mammoth establishments at home dazzled their eyes. Their shadows appeared to them like giant wonders of the world. The school-system, as such, was for them something too high and sacred to meddle with or control. A scholar then was one prodigiously educated—no empiric or smatterer. Professors, Doctors and titled heads could only come from such Cæsarean Forts. Of the people, as source and fountain to such establishments, they knew nothing. Even when a German Pennsylvanian University was mooted, it was only thought of as a

child of the Legislature, with thousands of acres of land. Not until near the close of the eighteenth century did the Lutheran pastor, Hartwick, succeed in founding a seminary, and alas! how inefficient did it prove for a long time. Our pioneer membership was intellectually feeble, as well as socially inferior and pecuniarily straitened.

VI.

We do not undervalue pure missionary labor; nevertheless, the Christian Religion requires, for its efficient acceptance, a certain elevation, intellectual and social. This reception, commerce and trade prepares in advance, like a certain forerunner. Holland understood this secret, and, by means of the East and West India Company, had entered upon the noble work of propagating a Christian civilization. In consequence of political revolutions and convulsions, her plan was defeated, and the German element was thus left independent and isolated, and consequently grew stagnant. Our forefathers became more and more rural, and thus ignored. The English element, in towns, cities and seaports, laid hold on, managed, and profited by the secular interests. If, by chance, a son of German descent grew to opulence by enterprise, he presently forsook his kindred and joined in with the efficient classes. Thus the Germans become clannish in language, manners, education and religion. Out of such a Nazareth you would verily cease to hope for any great enterprise.

The fountain at home was sealed; the intrusion of the English neighbors was ardently shunned and prevented; communion and intercourse with exotic elements was studiously avoided; books and literature were shut out; language degenerated; provincialism set in, and stagnation ensued. Their Religion alone remained. This was the sole lever of elevation left them. But "if the foundations be removed, what can the righteous do?"

Thus, then, we know in part, why the founding of a Church-school proved of so slow a growth.

Scattered in locality and variegated in character, from their first landing; poverty-stricken as a mass; harassed and annoyed by warfare and tumult; blinded by a pseudo-liberty; infatuated by a charmed glare of an educational superstition; and pent up by clannish walls—our forefathers were left alone.

In view of these and still other adverse causes, the educational movement among our forefathers was clogged and obstructed, defeated and crushed. Hence it was that the \$100,000 gathered by our venerable Schlatter, from benevolent hearts on the continent and from crowned heads in England, for the founding of a grand School system, for the elevation of German and English youths in America, as early as the middle of the eighteenth century, were wholly fruitless. Let any one read "Schlatter's Journal" and "Die Hallischen Nachrichten," and he may satisfy himself that all these causes operated against the founding of any central Institution for the German Reformed Church during this early period.

The after-effects of such evil potencies and tendencies, as we have now briefly and faintly detailed, came to the surface in fierce array, more especially during the generation next preceding the founding of the Theological Seminary. This is *the age of degeneration*, in the history of the American Reformed Church. Its principal features proved but parallel phenomena to facts and experiences that occurred time and again, during former ages and among other tribes and people. Ishmael descended from Abraham. Isaac's son, Esau, became the father of the Edomites. Israel deteriorated in Egypt, and even in Canaan, and as a Theocracy, under the Judges. The ancient Egyptians, Greeks and Roman colonies declined. The Roman Catholic tribes in Mexico and South America are marked cases in point. The Puritans and the Church of England, too, had their season of humiliation.

The American Reformed Church was but similarly blighted, as was to be expected. Her missionary condition rendered her, in greater measure, the sufferer and victim of revolution and

war. Her non-age even had not yet ended, when she was abandoned as an orphan by the mother Synod. The source of outward and foreign accessions had been closed through want of emigrants. Between the years 1784 and 1815, the stream of foreign influx hardly bore 2500 souls to the American shores. Commerce and communion with the parent country ceased. The ardor for evangelization and missions had been quenched. No more books, gifts and men from Halle, Wurtemberg and the Palatinate. It seems as though their prayers even had ceased to ascend for the child abroad. The young and tender vine had barely rooted ere it was left alone. The wonder is that it did not die to the root. But for the truly catholic and solid foundation, laid by the fathers of the first generation, and the healthy traditional order of religion, infused from the beginning, and which was preserved and fostered by the Liturgies, Catechisms, Hymn-books, and Books of Devotion, that had been early and freely scattered over the virgin ground;—but for this, the American Reformed Church must have died in the wilderness. God directs even Hagar to a fountain. Let us be thankful for such a perennial Religion. We will not sadden our hearts, on this gladsome occasion, by a recital of that dark day's history. Let us forget the journey through the Desert, now that we have entered a Canaan.

Only this let us note: There were Samuels in those days, even. We purposely record the names of those Tutor Pastors in the Germanic Churches, during the season of bondage. The Kunzes, Helmuths, Lochmans, Helfrichs, Helfensteins, Hermans, Beckers, Frieses, Reilys, and others.

These were solid men—pivot-men as well as prophet men. Let us not speak of them apologetically. Many of our German ministers and Holland dominies had all the qualifications of a thorough-bred professor, lacking mere position and title. Their bare apparitions to-day might perhaps drive a score of us to our grammars. Their Libraries left behind them, are small indeed, but choice and valuable. Tomes and Folio-Volumes,

written in the ancient tongues, spoke familiarly to them, however unintelligible they may, for us.

Thus God did not leave Himself without a witness, even during the dark age of the Church.

During the last half century a new motor entered the constitution of human society. The period of Restoration dawned. In Europe and America the new influx became at once apparent. A better genius perched and presided. A new and superior Theology supplanted the reigning order beyond the waters. A cosmopolitan ardor broke its way through the walls and fetters of nationalism and nativism, bearing thousands and millions of souls to our shores. The English Language became the vernacular of America. A Pentecost ripened. Missionary labor set in. Sunday-schools were planted. The Germanic Churches caught the spark, and the American Reformed Church, at last, saw her day of Orienting.

After thirty-two years of longing and silent agitation—from 1785 until 1817—a new departure was taken in the direction of a Theological Seminary. The Synod of York, in 1817, marks an epoch. Through Pastors Hendel, Hoffmeier, and Wack, in a sketch of the “Rise and Progress of the Reformed Church in this Country,” the whole subject was presented with much earnestness and force. A willing ear was lent, and Pastor Samuel Helfenstein moved that a committee be at once constituted to deliberate and report on the excellent project. This primary committee stood thus:—Pastor Wack, Pastor Helfenstein, Pastor Beecher, Pastor Mayer, and Elders Haverstick and Liebhardt. They reported promptly that the Synod should go forward. In view, however, of several overtures presented to the Church, one from the Reformed Dutch, and another from the Lutheran Church, both looking to the founding of a Union Seminary, the subject was remanded, with instructions, to further digest, and again report at a future day. At the Synod of Carlisle, in 1818, nothing was done with the Dutch proposition, in consequence of the non-attendance of our

Delegates during their Synodical Sessions. The Reformed Dutch Church, nevertheless, had moved on and appointed Commissioners to negotiate with the German Reformed Synod, and form a plan of union. Accordingly, the Pastors Jonathan Helfenstein and Reily were appointed a committee to hear the overture. The conference fruited in nothing definite, for the assigned reason, that a certain interest was held by the German Reformed Church, in common with other parties, in an Estate donated by the Legislature of this Commonwealth.

The overture from the Lutheran body met with a better reception, and a corps was designated to negotiate further. The Pastors Hoffmeier, Herman, Hendel, Pomp and Helfenstein were intrusted with its management.

The Synod of Lancaster, in 1819, simply heard, and continued the Committee, with the substitution of Pastor Becker in the room of Father Herman.

As the Church was divided into Classical Districts by this Synod, we now hear utterances from the minor Judicatories.

The projected plan of union with the Lutheran Church was put in printed form, and two hundred copies were ordered to be published and distributed. The Dutch Reformed Church had likewise approached the Synod once more, by means of "An Address to the Reformed Churches in the United States," by the Rev. Dr. Livingston, Professor of Theology, in New Brunswick, N. J. Further than a vote of thanks, we cannot learn that Synod ventured. A Seminary, however, now seemed near at hand. The Church was alive and interested. Lebanon Classis complained that no copy of the Reformed Lutheran Seminary had reached it; but declared itself ready to co-operate. The Classis of Maryland urges Synod to go forward in some way, as soon as possible. The Classis of Zion spoke in the same tone, and suggests, that, in case no union ever be effected, Synod forthwith open a Seminary, and that it be located in Chambersburg.

Synod became inspired, and during the Sessions at Hagers-

town, in 1820, resolved to establish an exclusively Reformed Theological Seminary. The Reverend Dr. Philip Milledoller was in attendance as a Delegate from the Synod of the Dutch Reformed Church. This Divine had been of us, though no longer with us. Born, reared, educated, licensed and ordained in the German branch of the Reformed Church; prominently known in the Dutch Reformed fold, as Pastor over important Congregations in New York City; and present at the moment of action in this direction—all this renders his election as Professor of Theology in the projected Institution easy to be accounted for. His Salary was fixed at \$2000. A Board of Visitors was elected, to which was committed the choice of a location, and the adoption of such means as would prove most efficient in securing funds. The Pastors Reily and Beecher were instructed to extend a call to the Professor elect.* Ser-

* The call extended to the Professor elect we here append. It will be noted that two years of suspense followed, which finally ended in a peremptory refusal to accept the call.

“TO THE REVEREND PHILIP MILLEDOLLER, D. D.,—

“REVEREND SIR:—The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States of North America, now in session, relying on the great head of the Church,”
 “has determined to establish a Seminary for the preparation of young men for the”
 “ministry in the Church of the living God, and for the organization of which the”
 “Synod turns to you. Under the conviction and in the possession of well estab-”
 “lished testimonials of your competency, godliness, knowledge, prudence, and”
 “other gifts, with which God has endowed you, the Synod has accordingly elected”
 “you, Reverend Sir, as with one mind, Professor of Didactic, Polemic and Pastoral”
 “Theology in the Seminary, now about to be founded, as this paper testifies; and”
 “you are hereby most sincerely called, urged and besought, to accept and take”
 “charge of the office of Professor of Theology, to which, as before noted already,”
 “you have been unanimously chosen. And in the event of your acceptance, the”
 “Synod promises you hereby all proper deference, and every encouragement for”
 “the fulfillment of the duties of your arduous and important office; and, besides”
 “this, an annual salary of two thousand dollars, to be paid in quarterly install-”
 “ments, so long as you shall remain the incumbent.”

“Done at Hagerstown, Maryland, A. D. 1820.”

The External History of the Theological Seminary commenced, properly, with the Synod of Hagerstown, Md., in the year of Grace, 1820. The plan of the institution was here proposed and adopted, as well as the call to the first Professor elect extended. Unforeseen barriers, however, soon appeared, and the Seminary did not become a fact in history until five years later.

mons were ordered to be delivered in the Pulpits, and Collections were asked for; private instructions for the ministry were to come to an end—all measures were adopted by which to rally the Church around the contemplated Seminary.

Then it was that the active Layman, Bernard C. Wolff, who grew into the Rev. Dr. Wolff subsequently, and still later into a Theological Professor—comes prominently before the Church. He needs no encomium in these notes. Living, he labored, and though dead, he yet speaketh.

The Synod of Reading, in 1821, tells through its Reports of the enthusiasm and hopes of the Church. Frederick, Md., had been fixed upon as the Theological Centre. Subscriptions to the amount of \$25,000 had been secured, together with other gifts, swelling the Endowment Fund to \$30,000. Voluntary offerings were, furthermore, pledged for the support of the Institution, until the funded moneys should commence to flow. All the steps of the Board were confirmed. The order of Study and the principal Language in the Institution was fully discussed. The Synod, being a General Convention, and forty-five out of seventy Ministers being assembled, the Church felt its authority and power, and dared to assert it. Discipline was to be enforced, in every case of non-compliance with the regulations of the Church.

The fair heavens were, however, soon marred and shadowed by a cloud, at first no larger than a man's hand, but subsequently swelling, alas! over the entire Church. It stood over for two full years, ere it emptied its dark contents!

Dr. Milledoller declined the call!

It were some relief to know, the reason why. But it is a mystery for us. The records are silent, and so are the Fathers. We are left to conjectures—unsafe things! Perhaps, after two years' delay and expectation, the hope of owning and possessing the German branch of the Reformed Church outright and entire, grew quite dim, and the Dutch Dominies abandoned the experiment, covering Dr. Milledoller under their wings, as they

retreated from the field. Perhaps Col. Henry Rutgers's legacy, which flowed into King's College, and turned King's College into Rutgers's College, drew Dr. Milledoller thitherward. At all events, we find the good Doctor President and Professor there in 1828 already. Perhaps the German Pastors did not look kindly on the importation of a foreign master over their heads, and spoke harsh words against him, which moved him to withdraw. Perhaps the stringent Synodical statutes, which raised a bitter opposition in Eastern Pennsylvania, and fostered the "Free Synod," changed the mind of Dr. Milledoller. Perhaps all these and still other considerations had their bearing. Certainly sorrow and jeopardy reigned for two years to come.*

* In confirmation of our various surmises, we present his letters from the Professor elect. They came to our hand in the pages of an old pamphlet, after our feeble attempt to write the External History of the Theological Seminary had been concluded, and during a review of the effects of our late and now sainted father:

"TO THE REVEREND L. MATER:"

"NEW YORK, February 20th, 1822."

"*Reverend and Dear Brother:*—A long time has elapsed since I last heard from "you, and ere this epistle will reach you, the meeting of the Board of Visitors "shall have been held; and I am most anxious, indeed, to learn through you "whatever pertains to the action taken by the Body."

"In case anything of an unfavorable or unpleasant nature should have transpired, I think you will not hesitate to inform me of it, for in a matter so pertinent, and situated as I am, I cannot know it too soon. I feel myself constrained to confess to you candidly, that I have not been free from doubts, since I signified my willingness to you to accept of the call. The term of office for a moiety of my consistory, in accordance with the orders of our Church, has in the meanwhile expired, and the succeeding party appears to be greatly dissatisfied with the action of the body, so far as I am directly involved, inasmuch as it is viewed not only as a premature, but as an unconstitutional step. A Committee of Investigation has accordingly been appointed, whose report is awaited by the Consistory at an early day.

"Moreover, since I addressed my last letter to you, a printed copy of your Synodical Proceedings came into my hands, in which I notice items which render the prospect a rather discouraging one.

"I read with astonishment the offering of a Resolution, in the Classis of West Pennsylvania, which contemplates the appointment of another German Professor beside myself, though the subject was postponed for the present. I have likewise been informed through a different source, which I know to be reliable, of the unmistakable declarations of Messrs. H. and V. D. S.'s fears, lest the institution might not meet with a sufficient support. Is the anxiety of these brethren the creation of some new light obtained, or am I to regard them as but the old perplexities reiterated?

And yet it was only a disappointment. What Church can escape such trials?

"Sorry as I am to annoy you with matters of such a tenor, you nevertheless" "will concede that they are calculated to create uneasiness in us, and that, in reference to certain points involved, you have it plainly in your power to either" "swell or quell such perplexity."

"With what success has your collection project met? Will the \$12,000 be forthcoming certainly by the 1st day of April, as contemplated by the plan you were" "kind enough to explain at York, and which the Finance Committee approved at" "Frederick on my recommendation?"

"You will place me under many obligations, should you impart to me a general" "summary of your progress and prospects."

* * * * *

"PH. MILLEDOLE."

"NEW YORK, March 18th, 1822."

"TO THE REVEREND L. MAYER:

"My dear Brother:---I have just received an abstract of the last entry on the" "Church Registry, and am informed that a like transcript has been furnished you." "The simultaneous arrival of the Consistorial Report, and your letter last written," "is indeed extraordinary, and all the circumstances connected with my call present" "a chain of profound and mysterious orderings of Providence, which I cannot pre-" "tend to penetrate."

"A dark cloud overshadowed the subject from the beginning. It was in consequence of doubts and difficulties, that the delay was occasioned at Harrisburg, as" "well as the resignation at York. A conditional promise, which I subsequently" "made to you and the Reverend A. Helfenstein, brought about the General Convention at Reading. And finally my acceptance occasioned the meeting and" "measures at Katstown."

"It is manifest, however, from this meeting and its attending circumstances, that" "all doubt is removed, and that my course is plain."

"Were I to move in the face of all that has transpired, and still transpires, I" "should be wronging my friends in the Synod, my Consistory in this city, my" "family, and myself. I am, consequently, compelled, as I hereby also do, to re-" "call my acceptance of the call of your Synod, and shall regard myself as released" "henceforth from all obligations, that may thus far have held the Synod and my-" "self as mutually bound."

"You will have the goodness, Reverend sir, to speedily inform all whom it may" "concern of this decision, and particularly our highly honored Brother, the" "Reverend J. Helfenstein, of Frederick. I will return the call, should you deem" "it proper, by the earliest opportunity, and to such place and person, moreover, as" "may be designated as custodians."

"I wholly exonerate you, my Brother, as well as those who acted in concert" "with yourself. The world was not committed to your disposal."

"I thank you for your *unswerving candor*, and for the partiality and esteem" "which you have manifested towards me during these investigations; nor shall I"

The Synod of Harrisburg was held in 1822 with sad hearts. But, as all is not lost that is in danger, the Board braced itself for a deliverance, proposed Harrisburg as the site for the Seminary, and the measure to elect a Professor there and then. The Pastors Hendel, Samuel and Jonathan Helfenstein, Hinsch and Reily were constituted a Delegation to visit and confer with the Consistory of the Reformed Congregations, both as to the eligibility of the place and propriety of having the coming man to serve in the double capacity of Professor and Pastor. As no more time was to be lost, their duty was promptly discharged, and favorably reported and acted upon. Thus the cloud seemed to break again. But as the Church thought it well to hasten slowly, Synod adjourned without consummating the project.

"ever cease to send my warmest prayers to Heaven, in behalf of you and yours,"
 "and the whole Church with which you stand identified.

"With feelings of the highest regard, I remain, Reverend and dear sir,

"Most sincerely yours,

"PH. MILLEDOLER."

* From the two epistles inserted above we may gather the following facts :—1) That a call has been extended to the Rev. Dr. Ph. Milledoler. 2) That the Rev. Dr. Ph. Milledoler felt from the start a reluctance to obey the call. 3) That he subsequently promised a conditional acceptance of the call. 4) That he afterwards resigned his Pastorate with the acquiescence of his Consistory and Classis, with a formal acceptance of the call in view. 5) That the Consistory, as subsequently constituted, annulled the action of the earlier Church Council, pronouncing it inexpedient and unconstitutional. 6) That an opposition arose in East Pennsylvania, both against the Institution as such, and as contemplated, which fruited in a schism. 7) That the Rev. Dr. Milledoler was moved, at last, to recall his acceptance of the call, by considerations of weight coming to the surface in both Churches, no less than in his own congregation. Far be it from us to censure the Rev. Dr. Milledoler. He doubtless moved as cautiously and conscientiously as any one of his learning, virtue and position would, under like circumstances. But it is strange, nevertheless, that a Consistory of a congregation believed itself competent to annul the virtual acceptance of the call on the part of Dr. Milledoler; that the Classis should stultify itself by confirming the contrary actions of both Councils; that Dr. Milledoler should have been so entirely passive in the hands of conflicting parties; and that all this negotiation, which covered the full time of two years, should have been carried forward, without a line of communication with the Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States. It appears that the dark cloud, which Dr. Milledoler seemed to see hovering over the matter, from the beginning, is likely to continue hovering, in *secula seculorum*.

The Synod of Baltimore, in 1823, found opposition arraying itself in several quarters. Philadelphia asked for a further postponement, and suggested a Board of Ministers as an Ecclesiastical Corps for young Candidates. Northampton was of the same mind. Lebanon deferred all to the wisdom of Synod. Maryland was willing to shoulder and carry the work alone. Synod, however, went straightforward, and resolved that Harrisburg be the site. An election was solemnly entered upon for a Professor. The candidates proposed were:—Samuel Helfenstein, Louis Mayer, and Jacob Christian Becker. Two ballots resulted in a tie. Pastor Louis Mayer then withdrew his name. The third ballot resulted in the choice of Samuel Helfenstein. A Board of Directors was at once elected, and a Salary of \$1000 fixed upon—one-half of which the Church was to secure, and the other half to be furnished by the Congregation of Harrisburg.

Whilst the Professor elect was deliberating, a whole year passed away, and the Synod of Bedford convened in 1824. In consequence of a new proposition, the contemplated and well-nigh consummated plan fruited in nothing. The Harrisburg scheme was suddenly and finally supplanted by a better and more successful project—the enterprise over whose Semi-Centennial Anniversary we are happy to-day.*

Here let us insert

*The Synod of Bedford adopted on Wednesday afternoon, September 29th, A. D. 1824, the following Report on the proposition from Carlisle:

“To establish a Theological Seminary has long been the uppermost wish of individual members of the Synod, as well as of the entire body. Besides having been regarded as a necessity, it is entertained as a project highly beneficent to the Reformed Church in this country. All around us institutions spring up, which are animated by the spirit and genius of the English tongue. A real enthusiasm inspires men to lay hold of all means, whereby the design may be realized, of rendering the English language the vernacular in imparting instruction in all the branches of science. A patriotism (warmth and zeal) reigns in this direction. The zeal, now noted, has become so general and dominant that the Germans in this country are in danger of forgetting their own tongue, in thus unconditionally surrendering themselves to the behests of English literature. German patriotism (love for our mother tongue) seems not only to be on the wane, but we are even becoming ashamed of

THE HISTORY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY—THE RECORD
OF FIFTY YEARS.

The Theological Seminary, now located at Lancaster, Pa., was instituted by the Synod of the (German) Reformed Church in the United States at its annual sessions, held in the town of Bedford in September, A. D. 1824, on the basis of an agreement made between the Synod and the Trustees of Dickinson College—Dickinson College being then under the supervision of the Presbyterian Church. The agreement provided that the Professor of Theology perform the duties of the chair of History and German Literature in the College, and that in return for this service the Seminary students have the right to attend, free of charge, the Lectures of the College Professors upon Moral Philosophy, Evidences of Revelation, Natural Theology, and Political Economy.

the German language, and are inclining to set it aside as superfluous. Forsooth, it has come to such an ebb, as that we seem to question whether anything of a scientific nature can be accomplished through the German as a medium. But if the most enlightened teachers in the higher English institutions declare that it is impossible to dispense with German literature, it is not only an imperative necessity, but the very fittest time, according to the view of the several members, as well as of the entire Body, to establish a German Institution, unless the German tongue shall die out in silence. It is not to be denied that an intemperate zeal, on the part of a number of members of this Synod, has multiplied, instead of removing, the difficulties in the way. But notwithstanding the fact that barriers arose, it is still true, that the zeal in behalf of the founding of such an institution was a healthy sentiment. Opposition will ever and ever confront us; but shall this prevent us from undertaking and consummating a work which is acknowledged on all hands as most necessary? Let but our zeal be crowned with prudence, for once, and our undertaking can and will prove a success under God's direction. No reason can be imagined more propitious than the one now upon us, since Dickinson College, in Carlisle, approaches us with a proposition, at once so honorable and brotherly, as the Reverend Synod may readily see in the address presented to the Board of Trustees. We, the undersigned Committee, would therefore most pressingly recommend to the reverend members of this Synod that they accept of this benevolent offer."

"LOBRECHT L. HINSCHE,"

"SAMUEL HELFENSTEIN,"

"JOHN S. IBACH,"

"DANIEL SCHNELTZ,"

"JOHN SAILER."

This Synod was at that time the only Synod of the (German) Reformed Church in America; excepting the small Synod of Ohio, just organized, which numbered *eleven* ministers and eighty congregations.

The Synod of Bedford, proceeding immediately to reaffirm the election of the Professor of Theology, the Rev. Samuel Helfenstein, Pastor of the Reformed Church, Race street, Philadelphia, and appointed a Committee to tender him a formal call. The Committee was also instructed, in the event of non-acceptance, to extend the same call to the Rev. Lewis Mayer, Pastor of the Reformed Church at York. Helfenstein declining, Mayer was called. The Committee succeeded in obtaining his services; and the spring following, on the *eleventh day* of March, 1825, the Theological Seminary was opened at Carlisle. *Five* students were in attendance: John Frederick Huber, Bedford; Henry Wagener, Centre county; John G. Fritchey, Dauphin county; John H. Crawford, Frederick county, Md.; and Daniel Heilig, Cumberland county. Of this first class there is one survivor—the Rev. John G. Fritchey—who, in the 73d year of his age, is still engaged in the work of the ministry.

At first the Seminary had the good will of only a part of the church. The election of the Rev. Dr. Milledoller as Professor of Theology by the Synod of Hagerstown, 1820, the location of the proposed institution at Frederick, Md., and the prohibition of all private theological teaching (before the institution was in existence); these things produced alienation of sentiment in some portions of Eastern Pennsylvania. This alienation, promoted by the operation of some other causes, became so violent that it issued finally in the organization of a separate Synod, in 1822.* Subsequent events, however—the election first of

* The famous secession of a part of the German Reformed Church, in Pennsylvania, chiefly, was a schism, rather than a heresy. The alienated party insisted strongly on retaining the Heidelberg Catechism, the Creed, and Customs of the Church, in the Organic Act, passed in Maxatawny Township, Berks Co., Pa., on April 24, A. D. 1822. The alleged cause for the schismatic movement was a

Dr. Mayer, and afterwards of Dr. Rauch—removed some of the occasions of dissatisfaction. More favorable views of the institution began to prevail, and more kindly feelings towards the old Synod. After the lapse of fifteen years, 1837, the division was healed by the fraternal re-union of the two bodies, and then all sections of the church joined in firmly supporting the Theological Seminary.

An experience of four and a half years having convinced the series of stringent measures touching the support of the contemplated Theological Seminary, by which the German congregations throughout Eastern Pennsylvania felt themselves aggrieved. This was a good, a popular pretext, whilst the real cause seems to have been the wound which the deposition of the popular but unhappy Frederick Herman inflicted on his learned and worthy father. Dr. F. L. Herman was the acknowledged head and leader of the alienated forces. His movement was attended with no little prestige, on account of his learning, extensive kinship, and goodly number of students, among whom we may mention the Rev. Dr. B. Schneck, Rev. D. J. S. Dubbs, Rev. Father T. H. Leinbach, Rev. Richard A. Fisher, and Rev. Peter S. Fisher.

The first name and title under which the new body was known, ran thus: "*The Synod of the Free and Independent German Reformed Churches in Pennsylvania.*" The number of Pastors swelled from five to twenty-five during the first nine years of its existence. In 1831 the name was changed to that of "*The Synod of the German Reformed Church in Pennsylvania and Adjacent States.*" A seal was accordingly procured, bearing on its face a flying eagle, with the gospel trumpet and olive branch. In 1832 the idea of founding a Church School, after the manual labor plan, was entertained; a friend in Cumberland County having offered to donate 250 acres of land for the purpose. But something still better was in store at the same time—an overture from the Parent Synod was conveyed to the wayward body. The response found its full and healthy utterance, in 1836. We cull from the Record this item, to wit:

The following preamble and resolutions were offered to Synod by brother J. S. Dubbs:

"Whereas the separation, which has taken place in the German Reformed Church has resulted for both now existing Synods in many uneasy consequences, which cannot but give pain to every noble spirited individual, and which, as we believe, all wish to be removed, therefore be it resolved, that the Rev. Synod send three Delegates to the General Synod of the Reformed Church, with a view to consult that Synod on the subject of an amalgamation, and that the result of the preceeding be laid before Synod in Pottstown, A. D. 1837, for their further deliberation. The following brethren were the delegates appointed:

J. S. DUBBS,
J. C. GULDIN,
C. G. HERMAN.

Adopted.

In 1837 the Free Synod met once more in Pottstown, Pa., and there died.

Church that Carlisle was "an unsuitable place for our Seminary," the Synod, in the fall of 1829, removed the institution to York, and took preliminary measures, on the recommendation of Dr. Mayer, "to connect with the Seminary a classical department, in which the Latin, Greek and Hebrew languages, natural philosophy, metaphysics, mathematics, logic, geography, history and composition shall be taught. To these the German language and literature must be added." *

The form of a charter for the institution was adopted, providing for a Board of Trustees and a Board of Visitors, the one to hold and manage the property, the other to have charge and control of the two departments of instruction, the theological and classical.

The Synod, at this meeting, received the Rev. Daniel Young, from the Presbyterian Church, and elected him Assistant Professor. This second Professorship did not receive a more specific title when instituted. Subsequently, it became first the chair of Biblical Literature, and then of Church History and Exegesis.

Virtually, the classical department, now formally authorized by the Synod, was already in existence. Many of the students not having received an academic training, the Professor found

* The removal of the Seminary from Carlisle to York was not effected without good and sufficient reasons. Among others, the delicate positions which Professor Louis Mayer was obliged to occupy, should be noted. He became likewise Professor of the German Language and German Literature in Dickinson College. But alas! there were no College students who thirsted after Teutonic waters. The College had assumed certain responsibilities and was making certain sacrifices, for which Professor Mayer was absolutely unable to render compensation, in any sense or degree. It is recorded to the honor of the Board of Trustees, however, that never the slightest insinuation fell from any member's lips to wound Prof. Mayer's feelings. But other parties were not so innocent, and still less above suspicion. Besides, Prof. Mayer did not feel like holding a sinecure, or to appear as one who was reaping where he did not sow. There was no call for the German language and literature in the latitude and ruling spirit of Dickinson College; and where there is not *that*, the Germanic Churches of the Reformation have no abiding-place or home. This consideration, along with the long-drawn controversy with the unfortunate and subsequently unhappy ENAUGH, so fully convinced the Synod of the propriety of a removal to York, Pa., that the vote resulted in *twenty-three yeas and one nay*.

it necessary even from the beginning to impart instruction in different branches of a preparatory course. The authority given the Board of Visitors to open a separate department of education was thus tantamount to a determination of the Synod to continue and enlarge, under an organized form, the course of academic study hitherto conducted by the Professor of Theology.

Opened at York on the eleventh of November, 1829, the Seminary was re-organized by the Board of Visitors according to the direction of Synod, being divided into two departments. The theological department from this time onward was able to address itself more exclusively to the proper work of a theological seminary. Professor Young had charge of Exegesis, and of Greek, in connection with some other branches of the classical department. But he was not permitted long to perform the duties of his office. His strength failing rapidly, he was constrained to retire in the course of the first year. He died at Augusta, Georgia, in the month of March, 1831. Professor Young enjoyed the confidence and the high regard of all who knew him, both for his scholarship and his excellent Christian character. The Charter, which was finally obtained, and under which the Seminary has existed until now, was obtained from the Supreme Court in 1831.

For two years all the theological instruction again devolved on one Professor. The classical department was, during this interval, put in charge of the Rev. Stephen Boyer, a minister of the Presbyterian Church, and Principal of the York county Academy.

The successor to Professor Young was the Rev. Frederick Augustus Rauch, D. Ph., who was elected to fill the vacant chair by the Synod of Frederick, in 1832. At the same time, Doctor Rauch was appointed Principal of the classical department, which thereafter came to be known as the High School of the Reformed Church.

Under the administration of this eminent scholar the High

School began at once to grow in numbers and efficiency; and soon took rank as a first-class academy. With the prosperity of the High School arose the question concerning a change of location. The desire and purpose of organizing the School into a College also began to prevail. In response to a circular inviting proposals, three were received; namely, from Chambersburg, from Franklin College, Lancaster, and from Mercersburg. The proposal from the citizens of Mercersburg was accepted by the Synod of Chambersburg, 1835; and the removal of the Institution, including both departments, was ordered. As regards the classical department or High School the order was at once carried out. During this and the greater part of the ensuing year the School at Mercersburg was conducted under the direction of the Seminary authorities. With the organization of Marshall College, in 1836, under another charter received from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, this organic convention with the Seminary was dissolved.

Two years longer, until 1837, the Seminary remained at York, in the hands of Dr. Mayer. In the fall of this year, it followed the High School, now Marshall College, to Mercersburg. Dr. Mayer, unwilling to go with the Seminary, resigned. Dr. Rauch, being the only Professor, had charge for the first year of the whole course of theological instruction. During 1837-38 there was one student in the Seminary.

At the earnest solicitation of the Synod, Dr. Mayer consented to resume his place in the Seminary in 1838. But he taught only one year. He retired, finally, in the fall of 1839.

For about six months the Seminary was again exclusively in the hands of Dr. Rauch. At the General Synod of Philadelphia, in 1839, Dr. J. C. Becker was elected a Professor. He declined the call. (See Vol. 6, Page 92, on Authors). At a special meeting of the Synod, held at Chambersburg, in 1840, the vacant chair of Systematic Theology was filled by the election of John Williamson Nevin, D. D., then Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church, at Allegh-

ny. Accepting the call, Dr. Nevin entered his new sphere of labor in the Spring of 1840, on the 20th day of May. There were nine students in the Seminary. The Endowment-Fund, all told amounted to \$3,000.

For one year, Dr. Nevin and Dr. Rauch were associated; and for the first time in the history of the institution, was the instruction conducted by two Professors, both of whom had received a complete classical and theological education.

Dr. Rauch died on the 2d of March, 1841, lamented by the ministry and membership of the entire Reformed Church, and by a large circle of appreciative friends in other denominations. Dr. Nevin succeeded Rauch as President of the College, retaining his place in the Seminary. For more than three years, Dr. Nevin, though President of the College, had, supported only by a teacher of Hebrew, exclusive charge of the Theological Seminary. In 1843, by a Special Synod, at Lebanon, Dr. F. W. Krummacher was elected to a Professorship, and Drs. B. Schneek and T. L. Hoffeditz were sent as a delegation to Europe, to present and urge the acceptance of his call. Rev. Krummacher declined.

The Rev. Philip Schaff, D. Ph., of Berlin, Prussia, was chosen successor to Dr. Rauch by the Synod of Winchester, in 1843. In the course of the year following he arrived at Mercersburg, and assumed the duties of his professorship. He was inaugurated at Reading, in October of 1844.

The Inaugural grew into the famous little work entitled: "The Principle of Protestantism." Published in German and English, it at once excited lively and general attention. Whilst the book awakened positive interest among the major portion of the Reformed Church, and served to establish confidence in the new Professor, it provoked also no small amount of adverse criticism, both from within and from without. It even brought on a trial of Dr. Nevin and Dr. Schaff before the Synod of York, 1845, on the charge of teaching anti-Protestant and anti-Reformed doctrines, preferred and prosecuted by

the Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D. D., and others. After full inquiry and a lengthy discussion, extending through several days, the attack was repulsed at every point, and the professors were vindicated by an overwhelming vote.

For more than seven years Drs. Nevin and Schaff labored together in the service of the Seminary and of the Reformed Church; the one having charge of Systematic and Practical Theology, the other of Church History and Exegesis. It was a period of intense mental and theological activity.

As both the High School and Marshall College were the outgrowth of the life of the Seminary, so in turn has the prosperity and efficiency of the Seminary ever been closely connected with the fortunes of the College. As Marshall College was not receiving adequate encouragement and support, the Trustees accepted from Franklin College, at Lancaster, a proposition to consolidate the two institutions. The two Colleges were united under a new Charter; and Marshall College was transferred to Lancaster, in the spring of 1853. Again the two institutions were separated. As in 1835, the Seminary remained at York, so now it is left alone at Mercersburg.

With the consolidation effected at Lancaster, Dr. Nevin became disconnected entirely both from the Seminary and the College. As early as September, 1850, he notified the Board of Visitors, that he intended to retire from the service of the Seminary at the close of the term. A sufficient reason was found, as he thought, in the discouraging and long-continued embarrassment of the treasury. The institution was not able to pay the salaries of two Professors. During the winter he taught voluntarily a private class in theology. At the next meeting of the Board, March, 1851, Dr. Nevin tendered his formal resignation of the office of Professor of Systematic Theology. He reiterated the reason previously assigned, adding that the circumstances of the College rendered it necessary that he devote all his time to that institution.

The resignation came before the Synod of Lancaster, 1851.

Many supposed that in consequence of the persecutions which Dr. Nevin and the Church had been enduring, and of his evidently fixed determination to retire, the Synod would quietly acquiesce in his purpose. But the matter took a different turn. The consideration of the question, in connection with a speech from himself in justification of the step he had taken, served to bring to the surface the deep sentiment of confidence and affection cherished towards Dr. Nevin throughout the Church; and instead of acceding to his wishes, the Synod requested him to withdraw his resignation. Grateful as was this expression of unshaken confidence, Dr. Nevin was not prevailed upon to change his mind. In the course of the year 1852, he presented his final resignation, in a communication addressed to the President of Synod.

During 1851, 1852, and the greater part of the year 1853, the instruction of the Seminary was in charge exclusively of one Professor, the Rev. Dr. Schaff. For three years and upwards the chair of Systematic Theology was vacant.

The successor of Dr. Nevin was the Rev. Bernard C. Wolff, D. D., Pastor of the Third Reformed Church, Baltimore. He was elected by the Synod of Baltimore, 1852. Dr. Wolff held his call to the Professorship of Theology for a year, when by letter he recommitted it to Synod, asking to be relieved of the responsibilities of the office. But the Synod (Philadelphia, 1853) again placed the call in the hands of Dr. Wolff, and requested him to accept it.

At the same time, 1853, Dr. Schaff obtained from Synod leave of absence for one year with the view of visiting Europe. The Seminary was in consequence closed for a period of twelve months, 1853-4. The first year of the separation of the College from the Seminary was a time of painful suspense.

With the return of Dr. Schaff to his post, in the fall of 1854, Dr. Wolff, having meanwhile accepted the chair of Theology, removed to Mercersburg, and the regular course of tuition was again resumed.

Contemporaneous herewith there was also an enlargement of the endowment fund, and an increase in the number of teachers. A legacy of \$10,000 was received from the estate of Mr. Daniel Kieffer, and a donation of \$5,000 from Miss Ann E. Keller. Let these Legacies be known as "First-fruits" in the history of the Seminary, and the generous donors never be forgotten. These generous gifts greatly relieved the financial distress of the institution. Soon after a Theological Tutorship, at the instance mainly of the Rev. Dr. Schaff, was established, partly by a fund invested in Germany, the gift of a member of the Prussian Cabinet, Baron von Bethman Hollweg, and partly by donations and obligations, some given by individuals and others by Classes of the Reformed Church; the scheme, as adopted by the Synod of Frederick, 1857, contemplating the appointment of two tutors by the Board of Visitors, the one to teach Hebrew and other branches of the course connected with Old Testament theology for two years in the Seminary, the other at the same time to prosecute his studies under direction of the Seminary Faculty for two years in the University of Germany. William M. Reily, A. M., and the Rev. Benjamin Bausman, A. M., were appointed in July, 1861; the former as teaching tutor, who of his own motion had previously passed about two years in the German Universities, and the latter as traveling tutor. Mr. Bausman declined. The Board then selected Jacob B. Kershner, A. M., October, 1861. Accepting the position, he was commissioned in March, 1862.

Now, for the first time in the history of the Seminary, did the Faculty consist of three regular Teachers, namely: Wolff, Schaff, and Reily, 1861-1862. But the Faculty thus organized taught without interruption only for about fifteen months.

Dr. Schaff, in October, 1862, applied to the Synod of Chambersburg for leave of absence for three months, in order to comply with an invitation received by him from the Theological Seminary at Andover, to deliver a course of lectures in that institution during the ensuing winter session. Synod reluctantly acquiesced. During the first part of the year 1863, the course

of seminary instruction had, in consequence, to be carried forward by the two remaining members of the Faculty, Wolff and Reily.

On the 16th of June, the institution was temporarily closed, on account of the invasion of the Confederate army under General Lee. A few weeks later, July 5th, Colonel Pierce and Dr. Elliott, acting Medical Director, took possession of the Seminary building for government hospital purposes. Between six and seven hundred wounded officers and privates of the Confederate army, retreating from Gettysburg, had, on that day, been captured between Greencastle and Williamsport, and the greater number were brought to Mercersburg. For this reason the session of the Seminary could not be resumed for the remainder of the season. But the wounded were gradually removed; and the building was prepared for the next session, which was ordered to open on the 8th of September. With the exception of this brief interruption, the students pursued their studies without molestation during the progress of the war.

In June of the same year, Dr. Wolff gave notice to the Board of Visitors of his purpose to resign his office. Agreeably to this purpose, he presented his formal resignation to the Synod of Carlisle, October, 1863, to take effect on the first of April, 1864, stating, among other things, "that when he first accepted your commission, it was with the determination to return it to your hands so soon as his sense of duty to the Church would allow him to do so." In accepting the resignation, Synod gave expression to her undiminished confidence in her retiring Professor, and bore grateful testimony both to his long and faithful labors in the service of the Church, and to his untiring devotion to the Theological Seminary.

The Synod proceeded immediately to the election of a successor. The Rev. Henry Harbaugh, D.D., Pastor of St. John's Reformed Church, Lebanon, Pa., was chosen Professor of Systematic Theology.

At the same meeting, the Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff addressed a

letter to Synod asking leave of absence from active service in the Seminary for a term of *two years*, commencing January 1st, 1864. Prominent among the reasons assigned were the completion of certain literary works, the educational interests of his family, and the desire once more to visit his fatherland. After much thoughtful consideration the request was granted. It was done, however, only with the understanding that, should his life be spared, he return at the expiration of the time specified, to the chair which he was about to vacate temporarily. Dr. Schaff's official relation to the institution continued during these two years following; but to the great regret of the Reformed Church, he did not afterwards return to resume the duties of the chair which for more than nineteen years he had, amid much self-denial, fulfilled with so much ability and acceptance.

The Board of Visitors was requested to secure, if possible, the services of the Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin, during the absence of Dr. Schaff; and in case his services could not be secured, to make the best possible arrangements to fill temporarily Dr. Schaff's place.

According to the provisions of the Tutorship scheme, the term of office of the teaching Tutor expired this year, 1863; but his successor presumptive being still in Germany, Tutor Reily was re-appointed; and he taught one year longer.

Promptly obeying the voice of the Church, Dr. Harbaugh repaired to Mercersburg without delay. He began to teach in January, 1864; and, at the request of the Board of Visitors, took the place for several months of Dr. Schaff. During the winter of 1864, the teaching of the Seminary devolved accordingly on Wolff, Harbaugh and Reily.

Dr. Nevin not acceding to the request of the Synod of Carlisle, the Board of Visitors elected the Rev. Thomas G. Apple, A. M., then pastor at Greencastle, to fill the chair of Church History during the temporary absence of the regular professor. He also declining, the Board proceeded to another election; when the Rev. E. E. Higbee, A. M., then pastor of Grace

Reformed Church, Pittsburg, was chosen. This was done in March, 1864. The Board succeeded in obtaining his services.

Dr. Wolff retiring agreeably to the conditions of his resignation, Dr. Harbaugh took charge of his own department of instruction in April, 1864. A few months later Mr. Higbee arrived at Mercersburg, and during the summer the Faculty consisted of Harbaugh, Higbee and Reily.

Meanwhile Mr. Kerschner, having returned from Germany, succeeded Mr. Reily, being appointed teaching Tutor in the fall of 1864. The licentiate William A. Gring, who was appointed traveling Tutor by Synod in 1863, declined the position. For various reasons (the disturbed state of our national finances, owing to the continuance of the civil war, being one), no other licentiate or alumnus, either then or afterwards, was chosen traveling Tutor. Mr. Kerschner's term of office expiring in 1866, he was by Synod reappointed teaching Tutor, for one year. Subsequently also he was reappointed from year to year, until 1871, when he communicated his desire to the Board of Visitors not to be continued in the office.

Under his appointment from the Board of Visitors, approved by Synod, Dr. Higbee discharged the duties of the vacant Professorship until the fall of 1865. Then the Synod, convened at Lewisburg, received the formal resignation of Dr. Schaff. The resignation was accepted; and Dr. Higbee was by acclamation elected Professor of Church History and Exegesis. By this act, the Faculty was again regularly organized; and for two years longer, the instruction of the Seminary, was in charge of Harbaugh, Higbee and Kerschner.

The four years during which these three Teachers were associated, were a period, like previous administrations, of positive progress and active conflict, as well for the Reformed Church as for her theological School. A new phase in the line of opposition within her own communion was provoked by the act of the Carlisle Synod, the election of Dr. Harbaugh, an active member of the Committee that prepared (and afterwards re-

vised) the "Order of Christian Worship," 1857, an able and zealous defender of the central Christological truth characterizing the theology of the Seminary, and a man of extensive influence as a prolific and popular author and a powerful preacher of the gospel. This opposition, however, instead of producing hesitation, served rather to awaken a clearer apprehension of the intrinsic value of the spiritual interest at stake, and to call forth stronger expressions of confidence in the fidelity and devotion of the Seminary to her solemn trust. The attendance of students was large and the number of graduates annually above the average. Important additions were also made to the permanent fund, the result of the Tercentenary Jubilee, celebrated in 1863. As evincing the general mind of the Church, the fact is significant, that when, at the second Tercentenary Convention, held at Reading, May, 1864, and composed of all ministers and elders who chose to attend, the sum of over sixteen thousand dollars, a part of the freewill offerings of the people, was reported as not designated by the donors to any particular object, this sum, after a full discussion of the question, was appropriated to the endowment fund of the Theological Seminary.

But the efficient organization of the Faculty was soon to be interrupted by the premature death of Dr. Harbaugh. His health failing during the summer months of 1867, he sank gradually under the grasp of brain disease, until the 28th of December, when, with the expiration of the fourth year of his Professorship, he departed this life in the fifty-first year of his age, triumphing over the pain of dissolving ties and hopes in the light and joy of living Christian faith.

For the remainder of the Seminary year the duties of the vacant chair were performed, under appointment of the Board of Visitors, by the Rev. Thomas G. Apple, D. Ph., then residing in Mercersburg, and President of Mercersburg College.

At a special meeting, convened at Harrisburg in March, 1868, Synod elected the present incumbent of the chair of

Systematic and Practical Theology, the Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., then Professor of Moral Philosophy and Psychology in Franklin and Marshall College; who, consenting to the call of the Synod, and removing to Mercersburg in the month of August, began to teach with the opening of the fall term, in September, 1868. Then for three years the Faculty of Instruction consisted of Gerhart, Higbee and Kerschner.

From the time of the consolidation of Marshall with Franklin College at Lancaster, there prevailed, both in the Faculties and in the Church at large, more or less dissatisfaction with the local separation of the two institutions. Originally but different departments of one organization, and afterwards, when managed by separate Boards, still animated by the same life under the tuition of the same educational headship (the first President of Marshall College being the Professor of Biblical Literature, and the second being Professor of Systematic Theology), the two had grown in strength together, and were cemented by the experience of common trials and common struggles; the College receiving sympathy and moral support from the Seminary, and the Seminary from the College. A sense of his reciprocal dependence prompted a series of efforts to re-establish a closer fellowship, which finally resulted in the removal of the Seminary to Lancaster. In this connection, let us not forget to note the efficient service rendered by the Rev. Dr. J. C. Bucher.

In the matter of removal, the Synod at York, 1866, instituted preliminary measures. These were followed, two years later, by more decided action taken by the Synod at Hagerstown, 1868. This action the Synod of Danville, 1869, re-affirmed. All these proceedings were brought to a final conclusion at Mechanicsburg, in 1870. That Synod formally ordered the Board of Trustees to remove the Seminary from Mercersburg to Lancaster during the year ensuing. The Trustees were instructed to obtain from Franklin and Marshall College the legal conveyance of the five acres of land offered

by said College towards the removal, and then to proceed at once to the erection on these grounds of such buildings as would be necessary for the proper accommodation of the Seminary. Authority was also given the Trustees to lease the real estate of the Seminary at Mercersburg, for educational purposes of the Reformed Church, to Mercersburg College, a vigorous institution of learning, organized in 1865 under the authority of Mercersburg Classis, and managed by a Board of Regents, who are elected by the same ecclesiastical body. Measures were immediately taken by the Seminary Trustees to execute this order; and in the fall of the year 1871 the removal was consummated. After eighteen years of separation, the mother relinquishes her romantic mountain home, where for four-and-thirty years she had been residing, surrounded by a large circle of warm and faithful friends, who in every hour of trial had ministered to her wants, and follows her daughter to the place of her new abode, to re-unite their intellectual and spiritual energies in the service of their common Lord and Master.

Several months after the adjournment of the Mechanicsburg Synod, the Rev. Dr. Higbee gave notice to the Board of Visitors of his intention to resign his Professorship. A special session of Synod was accordingly convened at Lancaster in July, 1871. In his resignation, Dr. Higbee stated that for some time he had been convinced that he could be more useful to the Church, and serve with more satisfaction to himself in others fields of labor. Yielding to his wishes, the Synod recorded its high appreciation of the valuable services of Dr. Higbee during his seven years' connection with the Seminary, and its sincere regret that any circumstance had occurred which, in his judgment, rendered it necessary to withdraw from this particular field of labor.

The Synod proceeded to hold an election, when the Rev. Thomas G. Apple, D. D., was chosen Professor of Church History and Exegesis. Dr. Apple accepted the call, and took his place in the Faculty in the month of November following.

The matter of the appointment of a teaching Tutor also came before the Lancaster Synod. But no appointment was made. Instead, the whole subject was referred to a committee of seven, with instructions to report at the next annual meeting, to be held at Pottstown.

The Seminary was opened at Lancaster at the regular time, namely, on the first Wednesday of September, 1871. The Rev. Dr. Gerhart being the only Professor on the ground, he was, at the request of the Board of Visitors, assisted in teaching by the Faculty of Franklin and Marshall College; an arrangement which was continued for two months.

The Committee on the Tutorship reported to the Synod of Pottstown that, after bestowing much thought upon the subject, they were not able to settle their minds on any one. Not venturing to make any nomination for the vacant Tutorship, the Committee did no more than to submit several points for consideration.

These suggestions pertained to the creation of two German Professorships: one in the Seminary, by raising the Tutorship to a regular Professorship, and the other in Franklin and Marshall College. The suggestions were carefully considered, and adopted. The plan anticipated the active co-operation and support of the German ministers and German congregations. In view of this action the Board of Visitors were authorized to make a temporary arrangement for supplying the teaching of the Theological Tutor. As the anticipations of the Synod were not realized, and in consequence the German Professorship scheme was not consummated, a record of the details is superseded.

Shortly after the adjournment of the Pottstown Synod, the Board met and appointed the Rev. Frederick A. Gast, A. M., Theological Tutor, then Professor in Franklin and Marshall College. Professor Gast assumed the duties of the tutorship in January, 1872. The Synod of Martinsburg approved the choice of the Board, and re-appointed Professor Gast Tutor for one year.

The year following, 1873, the Tutorship was changed, conformably to the hypothetical provisions of the tutorship scheme, into a full Professorship, and Tutor Gast was elected Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Theology, by the Synod in Bloomsburg, Pa., in 1873. He was inaugurated on the 11th of May, in 1874. The instruction of the Seminary at Lancaster has accordingly during these four years been in charge of Gerhart, Apple and Gast.

At different times during the last decade, the Synod has taken measures to establish another professorial chair. The sixteen thousand dollars voted by the Convention at Reading, 1864, were designed for a Tercentenary Professorship. Four years later, the Synod of Hagerstown directed the Board of Trustees to complete the endowment of this chair, and elected the Rev. Daniel Gans, D. D., Professor of Biblical Exegesis. But the operations of the agent in behalf of the removal, interfered with the proposed addition to the endowment fund; and the Rev. Dr. Gans, regarding his election as premature, did not see his way clear to accept the call. Nothing effectual has since been done; and the Professorship of Biblical Exegesis is still a desideratum.

The formation of the Synod of Pittsburgh, 1870, and of the Synod of the Potomac, 1873, out of classes belonging (Westmoreland Classis only excepted,) to the Synod of the United States, left the Seminary, by the natural course of things, exclusively in the hands of the original organization. It became in law the possession of a part, instead, as before, of the whole of the Reformed Church East. To neutralize the moral effect of this legal limitation, a plan of co-operation in the management, control and support of the Seminary, was initiated in 1872, and consummated in 1873, between these three bodies, whereby each organization is represented proportionably, in the Board of Trustees, and in the Board of Visitors. Under the operation of this plan of union, each Synod has a voice conjointly with the others: as in managing the property

of the institution, so also in supervising the course of instruction, and directing all its internal affairs.

During the fifty years of its history, the Seminary has had in its service *thirteen* professors and tutors.

Of the chair of Systematic Theology, coeval with the organization of the Seminary, there have been *five* incumbents: Mayer in office *thirteen* years; Nevin *eleven*; Wolff *ten*; Harbaugh *four*; and Gerhart *seven* years.

Of the next chair, established in 1829, now entitled the Professorship of Church History and Exegesis, there have also been *five* incumbents: Young in office *one* year; Rauch *nine* years; Schaff *nineteen*, exclusive of the last two years not in actual service; Higbee *seven*, including two years under appointment of the Board of Visitors; and Apple *four* years.

During the twelve years the Theological Tutorship was in existence, 1861-1873, there were *three* tutors: Reily in office *three* years; Kerschner *seven*; and Gast *two* years.

The chair of Hebrew and Biblical Theology, established in 1873, has during these *two* years of its existence been occupied by Professor Gast.

The largest class of students was graduated in 1850, numbering *fourteen*. The whole number on the roll of graduates is *three hundred and nineteen*; including the Class of 1875.

For the last two years the Seminary has had on its roll the names of *thirty-four* students. This number of students in attendance is larger than that of any previous year.

When this Theological Seminary, the first educational institution of the Reformed Church in the United States, was organized, there were about *eighty* ministers, all told, East and West, in her communion. The number in 1875, according to the latest statistical tables, is *six hundred and nineteen*.

The supply of ministers during the progress of these fifty years has at no time been equal to the demand. Yet for that large measure of success which has crowned the work of the

church in educating men for the holy office, it is meet that the people celebrate with joy and gratitude the goodness of God.

But most histories are but skeletons. Ours is a most imperfect and meager one. There is, and ever must remain, an unwritten history of the conception, founding and progress of the Theological Seminary, more interesting than ever can be recorded. There is a roll of honor, hidden to our eyes, but precious in the sight of the Lord. God finds His laborers wherever He appoints a work. He has His hours, men and means. He calls all, many come, the few are chosen. During our Seminarian period, all these were according to the day. Agents stood forth to travel and labor in the good cause. Their ringing circulars sounded abroad and arrested the ear of the willing ones. Such Pastors as Hendel, Reily, Ebaugh, Schneck, Mayer, Beecher, Hinsch and others immortalized their names during all the ages to come. They canvassed our own and other lands.

It is interesting to notice the ingathering of gifts at their earnest and diligent prayers. These names have a strange ring for us:—

Gov. De Witt Clinton, \$20.00; Gen. Van Rensselaer, \$10.00; Col. Henry Rutgers, \$200.00; John Jacob Astor, \$50.00; the Livingstones, from \$15.00 to \$50.00; Martin Van Buren, \$5.00; Doctor Chapman, \$10.00.

The following Pastors of other churches showed a warm heart for us:—Rev. Dr. James Milnor, \$10.00; Rev. George Mills, \$35.00; Rev. Dr. Ely, \$20.00; and Broadhead, Hoge, Know, Wilson, McCarty, Skinner and Anner, and numerous others who donated crumbs which swelled to the sum of one thousand dollars. Let us remember them as friends in need.

We gladly record the name of Mrs. Rev. Dr. Bethune. May her name be ever fragrant among us.

Nor ought we to forget to make special mention of the Reily Agency in Europe. His active and efficient service netted a

sum of \$5000.00, and many valuable volumes for the Seminary Library besides.

And in scattering encomiums on friendly hearts outside of the fold, let us not forget our own kindred Clergy and Laity. We point with pride to many a working Pastor of our Reformed Church. They reached the hearts and purses of our membership more directly and effectually than all other agencies. But for many of such firm and brave souls, the Seminary would never have been founded, and still less, eked out its history fifty years. We bless the hearts of these old self-denying Pastors, who so unselfishly spoke, prayed and begged for the support of our Institution which never brought any interest to them, and whose semi-centennial they were never to see. Through them the avenues of public charity were first opened in the Reformed Church, in which a Kieffer, a Keller, a Wanner, a Weiser, and others walked. May many continue to catch the spark from this day onward. And if the present generation of Pastors, all of whom who have gone forth from the School of the Prophets, which was built up in doubt, heart-throes, anxiety, tears, prayers and sacrifices—as God only remembers,—will but follow in the wake of their predecessors and fathers, it will never be said of the Reformed Church—“She began to build but was not able to finish.” But if we prove unworthy sons of noble sires, then let the stones cry out against us, from amid the ruins.

“The Lord our God be with us, as He was with our Fathers; let Him not leave us, nor forsake us; that He may incline our hearts unto Him, to walk in all his ways, and to keep his commandments, and His statutes, and His judgments, which he commanded our Fathers.”

ART. II.—THE INTERNAL HISTORY OF THE SEMINARY.

BY PROFESSOR THOS. G. APPLE, D. D.

FATHERS AND BRETHREN:—

It is with some degree of diffidence that I attempt to discharge the duty assigned me by this reverend Synod, of presenting an essay on the theological history of the Seminary, whose semi-centennial anniversary we are celebrating on the present occasion. It would be a less difficult task to present the history itself in full, which would require, however, at least a volume, than to attempt to gather up that history in the compass of a single address. In view of the difficulties connected with the duty, I could wish that it had been assigned to some one better able to perform it. But, while I ask your indulgence for any imperfection and incompleteness that may attach to my essay, I proceed without further introduction to discharge the task assigned me.

The literature from which mainly our knowledge of the subject must be derived, and which deserves to be enumerated here as a part of the history itself, is the following: Dr. Lewis Mayer's Lectures on Systematic Theology, and on Hermeneutics and Exegesis, and his Expository Lectures or Discourses on Scriptural Subjects, and Synopses of Sermons; the writings of Dr. Augustus Frederick Rauch, consisting of his work on Psychology, his Lectures on *Æsthetics* and Ethics, and his published Sermons on the Inner Life; the Lectures of Dr. J. W. Nevin on Theology, his works, on the Anxious Bench, on the History of the Heidelberg Catechism, the Mystical Presence, Antichrist, his Lectures on Christian Ethics, and his numerous articles in the *Mercersburg Review*, and in the *Weekly Messenger*, and the *Reformed Church Messenger*; Dr.

Philip Schaff's *Principle of Protestantism*, his *History of the Apostolic and Primitive Church*, and his articles in the *Kirchenfreund* and *Mercersburg Review*; Dr. Ebrard's *Dogmatic and Practical Theology*, translated and commented on by Dr. B. C. Wolff; Dr. Harbaugh's *Lectures on Dogmatics and Practical Theology*, and his articles in the *Mercersburg Review*; and Dr. E. E. Higbee's *Lectures on Church History*, and his articles in the *Mercersburg Review*.

In referring to this material from which we gather the theological history of the Seminary for the past fifty years, I make the preliminary remark, that we must distinguish between the direct teaching imparted in the Seminary, and works and articles written outside this teaching. It is made the duty of teachers of theology in our Church, not only to impart instruction to the students committed to their care, but also in their public writings to defend the true faith of the Church. There is, in this view, a grave responsibility connected with such writings. And yet a theological teacher may make contributions to the science of theology in articles or essays on topics that have not come to be matters of dogmatic teaching, concerning which a certain amount of freedom is allowed beyond the strict obligations of the teaching in the class-room. Or he may write on topics that *are* matters of dogmatic teaching, with a view to advance them beyond the stand-point of the standards and confessions of the Church. In the class-room he teaches according to the standards of the Church; but, if he have the talent, ability, and calling, he may, in a more public way, before the general theological public, discuss questions from a more catholic stand-point for the benefit of other Christian denominations as well as of his own. The private Christian, the minister, and the teacher of theology, must feel themselves related to the Church Catholic as well as to a particular denomination. The denominational Church, or the Seminary under its charge, does not necessarily become responsible for all that is written in this way. Such freedom must be allowed, other-

wise there would be no room for progress in theology. Our own Church has shown a right sense on this point and made a proper discrimination. This Synod, on one occasion, decided that while it found no occasion to question the orthodoxy of the teaching in the Seminary, when judged from such articles and essays written and published outside the class-room, yet it did not feel itself called upon to endorse all that was presented to the public in this way by its theological professors.

THE SEMINARY AT CARLISLE AND YORK.

With this preliminary remark, I proceed now with my treatment of the subject before us, beginning with some notice of the general character of the theology taught in the Seminary, while it was located at Carlisle and York, by its first Professor, Dr. Louis Mayer, from 1825 to 1836, when the Institutions were removed to Mercersburg, Pennsylvania. My information here is derived from a somewhat careful examination of Dr. Mayer's Lectures on Systematic Theology and on Hermeneutics and Exegesis, as well as from Synopses of Sermons and a small work containing some lectures on religious subjects. Dr. Mayer was a man of good natural talents, with a fair scholarship in some departments of theological science, and a certain originality of thought, and his memory as a faithful minister and teacher is justly revered in the Church.

In endeavoring to characterize his theology in general, it is not necessary for our purpose to dwell upon those particular topics on which his teaching seemed to vary somewhat from the accepted orthodoxy of the Church, on the doctrine of the Trinity, the person of Christ, the atonement, and original sin. This variation consisted not so much, perhaps, in a departure from the usual definitions of the dogmas of the Church, as in the manner of their explanation; and in this, while we might not be prepared to endorse his views, there is evidence of some originality of thought, and an effort to attain to a more satisfactory position than the old theological ruts afforded. At any

rate, these peculiarities did not seem to leave any evil results in the faith of his students. In the main, his system fell in with the current theology of the Reformed Church in his day. It was the theology that had come down from the seventeenth century, and differed in its stand-point from the theology of the Reformation and that of the later German theology, especially since Schleiermacher.*

The stand-point of his theology is Theistic, as compared with the Christological, or, as it has been called by Dr. Nevin, and later, in his Dogmatics, by Dr. Van Oosterzee, Christocentric.† The Divine Will is made the principle of redemption, instead of

* "A new era, even for Dogmatics, has dawned in our century, which has not incorrectly been called the century of the regeneration of Christian Theology. Instead of the earlier Rationalism and Supranaturalism, both of which were in their stand point equally one-sided, a more exact and fruitful conception of truth arose as life from God, historically revealed in Christ, and only learnt through the light of Scripture by individual spiritual experience. This school of thought in Dogmatics, starting from Germany, has made its influence felt in the various Churches of other countries, and has held its own with increasing clearness and firmness against the attacks of an unbelief becoming every day more devoid of shame. Enriched by the wisdom of the past, and purified by the ordeal of the present, science strives restlessly—although in countless windings, and not without a strong reaction—towards a fairer future, in which, in even a greater degree than before, she can fulfill her undeniable requirements."

See also the paragraph in the same section, in which he speaks of Schleiermacher as "the German Plato," whose name "is closely connected with the history of the revival of Dogmatics in Germany," and where he says, "it is impossible to deny that he has given to the scientific movements of his time" the impulse of an eternal motion, "and, as another John the Baptist, may be called a new forerunner of Christ."

Christian Dogmatics. Van Oosterzee. Published under the editorship of H. B. Smith and P. Schaff, vol. i. pp. 48-49.

† "No one can be the Fountain-head for the investigation of Christian Dogmatics, but He who is its principal subject-matter, and who is not only the faithful witness, but Himself the highest revelation of truth in the domain of religion. True Dogmatics is thus, from its nature, Christo-centric; and nothing, in regard to the doctrine of salvation, can be acknowledged as truth, that is in irreconcilable contradiction with the word and Spirit of Christ, the King of truth. . . . Everything which Dogmatics has to teach concerning God, man, the way of salvation, etc., must be viewed from the light which streams forth from Christ as centre. 'Certum, propriumque fidei catholice fundamentum Christus est.' Augustine." Van Oosterzee's Dogmatics, p. 15.

Christ. It resolves the supernatural revelation which God has made to the world into a plan or scheme of redemption, which He carried out instrumentally through His Son, Jesus Christ. The substance of revelation is regarded as an order of truth, a knowledge of God and divine things, the nature of man in his original and fallen state, of the method necessary to redeem him from sin and death, and to restore him to the divine favor and love. Christ is regarded rather as the instrumental cause than the source of redemption and eternal life. The plan of redemption was revealed to men in His teaching, and wrought out by His work, especially by His death upon the cross. According to some, both His active and passive obedience were necessary and constituent parts of this work, but according to others, the former was only a condition in order to render the latter effectual. The law of God having been properly vindicated before men and angels, the way was now open for God to extend pardon to man, and through His Spirit to prepare man by conversion, regeneration and sanctification, to enjoy the benefits of the salvation provided for him. There is here no necessary and internal connection between the person and life of Christ and the salvation of believers, except that the former is regarded as the procuring cause of the latter.

From the time of Wolff—the last two decades of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century—down to the time of Schleiermacher, supernaturalism and rationalism struggled for the mastery. This struggle, in the form in which it had gone forward, was to a large extent superseded, when a new and different stand-point for theology was reached, which regarded the person of Christ as the source of salvation, the substance of Christianity, and the principle of theology. Since then, the struggle has not indeed ceased, but it revolves now around a new centre, not, as then, the inspiration of the Scriptures, but the ever-living and life-giving person of the Lord Jesus Christ. This is clearly indicated by the new mode of attack adopted by such men as Strauss, Bauer and Renan—

whose effort has been, not merely to set aside the credibility of the Scriptures, but rather, accepting these, to dissipate the supernatural character of the person of Christ. And the best apologetic literature of later times consists in the defence of the faith in the person of Christ, as the substance of revelation, which gives to the Scriptures all their power and life.

The general theological position of the Seminary at that time, we believe, was in sympathy with the mind and spirit of the Church, at least in the English portions of it, and, we may add, with the mind and spirit of surrounding denominations. The German sections of our church had not as yet come into much acquaintance or sympathy with the Seminary, and pretty much the only theology that exerted any controlling influence upon the country at large was the Puritan and Presbyterian. The German Churches of this country had not come as yet to assert any proper status before the theological public. Our own Church had no literary institutions except a high school, then growing into a college. Our English congregations were necessarily left to the influence of the large English denominations of the land. In view of these circumstances it is plain that the Seminary labored under many serious difficulties, and required time before it could exert much power.

THE SEMINARY AT MERCERSBURG.

The next period in the history of the Seminary is that which opens with its removal to Mercersburg, where it was brought under the care of Drs. Rauch, Nevin, and Schaff, though Dr. Rauch taught in it also at York, and for a short time Dr. Mayer taught at Mercersburg.

The change which took place in the general character of the theology taught here, which consisted, we may say, not in the introduction of new dogmas, nor in the rejection of old ones, but rather in the method by which they were held together in a scientific system, and the principle pervading them, was reached through a transition of a practical rather than of a

theoretical or speculative character. In the new stadium of growth to which the church was attaining in the change from German to English, and the establishment of institutions of a higher character, it was challenged to understand and assert its proper denominational character and life. The old system of educational religion, with which stood connected the catechization of the young, was confronted with another system coming from another direction, which, whatever merit it possessed in its own sphere, was to a large extent foreign to the traditional life of our church. It had already worked its way into our congregations, mainly the English, though it had reached to some extent some sections of Eastern Pennsylvania, the stronghold of the Reformed Church. Our church needed a revival, an awakening from a spirit of comparative inactivity, but the danger was that in this new revival to new activity we would lose our true historical life, and thus become powerless as a denomination. How far this danger would have been avoided without the Seminary it is not for us to say. We only state the fact that the effective warning came from that quarter in the pungent and telling tract on the Anxious Bench. Along with this came also the able and exhaustive articles on the History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism, through both which the church was summoned to study carefully its own spirit and genius, and hold fast to the old landmarks amidst the peculiar dangers that threatened on every side. We refer to these facts, not to dwell upon them, but to show that the system of theology and philosophy which originated and grew into vigor during this period was not the result of abstract speculation, but stood in the closest sympathy with the practical wants of the church.

In order that the catechetical or educational system of religion might hold its own against what was arrayed in opposition to it, the meaning of infant membership in the Church must be a reality for faith, and not rest on a mere dead German traditional custom. And if there is a reality for faith in infant

membership, there must be meaning also in infant baptism, and if there is grace in baptism, then there must be a bosom of gracious power lodged in the Church, and so we get to the dogma of the Church and the sacraments, the consideration of which, from the practical side at least, first occupied the special attention of the professors at Mercersburg.

What was coming rapidly to be the popular theory of the Christian life in the revivals that prevailed at the time throughout the land, made little or no account of baptism or Christian nurture. It rather regarded any reliance on baptism as a danger and an impediment in the way of conversion. It had no proper idea of an objective constitution of grace in the Christian Church, according to the faith of all ages as contained in the Apostles' Creed, through which and in which the grace and blessings of salvation are mediated by the Holy Ghost. It did not apprehend the historical character of Christianity and the science of Church History was made to consist largely in the mechanical putting together of facts and statistics which might be laid up in the memory as a sort of treasury of old and dead antiquities.

The study of the Church received a new impetus at this juncture by the arrival of Dr. Philip Schaff, a young man, fresh from the Universities of Germany, a finished scholar, full of enthusiasm in his department, and imbued with the new life which Neander, the father of modern Church History, had thrown into the science, as well as unquestioning faith in the revival of theology in Germany which was sweeping away the strongholds of rationalism.

Opening his professional career with his able production, *The Principle of Protestantism*, he was fully prepared to fall in with the reigning thought on this subject in the Seminary. His lectures opened up a new current and awakened new life in a science which for the students previously possessed but little interest. While Dr. Nevin was writing his profound articles on the Apostles' Creed, seeking to revive the old and tried faith

of the Church, Dr. Schaff was unfolding its organic history with a mastery of his material and a vigor of style which placed him at once in the front rank of Church historians in this country, and, what was of more account, won for him a reputation in the old world.

The Church Question loomed up as the question of the age. In order to maintain the historical character of Christianity and vindicate the Protestant Reformation, it seemed necessary to consider the antecedents of the great movement of the sixteenth century and its relation to them, so as not to surrender to the claims of Rome on the one hand, nor be overwhelmed by an unhistorical, pseudo-Protestantism, on the other. The Seminary was awake to both evils. The masterly articles by Dr. Nevin on Brownson's Review, the editor of which was the ablest controversialist in the Roman Church at that time in this country, present, we think, the strongest argument against the claims of the Roman Church that has been produced by any theologian in America.

But how to solve the problem in view of the dangers presented by an unchurchly Christianity, and the evils of sectarianism on the other side, revealed a greater difficulty. The abnormal condition of Protestantism, with its endless divisions, was pointed out in pungent articles on Sectarianism and Anti-Christ—the Spirit of Sect and Schism—by Dr. Nevin, and by Dr. Schaff, in the *Kirchenfreund*, to whom at that time this seemed to be the most deadly disease of Protestantism. To some it appeared as if this faithful exposure of the evils of Protestantism involved a want of loyalty to the whole cause. How can Protestantism claim the possession of the essential attributes of the Church as one, holy, catholic, and apostolic? The Anglican Church was in the midst of an agitation that caused it to tremble to its foundations. The Tractarian movement had drawn into its current the ablest minds and most earnest ministers of England in an effort to reprimatinate primitive Christianity. Some of these, among the ablest and the best, were already

drifted on the shoals and quick-sands of Romanism. Was Puseyism a solution of the Church Question? The articles on the Anglican Crisis, on Cyprian and Early Christianity, was the reply from Mercersburg. For those who did not properly understand the argument, and we may say also for those who did, these articles were startling, and awakened wide-spread alarm. The tendency of early Christianity, it was argued, carried in it far more than Anglican Episcopacy, even of the Puseyite, Sacramentarian type. The germs of Mediæval Romanism were already there. To begin again with these and thus attempt to repristinate Christian history involved by logical necessity something very different from Protestantism in any of its phases. To repristinate here is to Romanize.

The difficulty was increased by the consideration that the primitive Church had already been held up as the common heritage for all subsequent ages, especially as it had given us the common Creed of Christendom. If we are to receive its great creeds, and reverence its great fathers, must we not accept it as a whole? For those who had no faith in the historical character of Christianity, who look upon the Church merely as an aggregation of individuals, whose spiritual life is separately drawn from the word of God through the Holy Spirit, without any necessary connection with the Church and the sacraments, there was no difficulty here. But with those who did make earnest with the article in the Creed, "I believe in the holy, Catholic Church," who looked upon the Church as "the mystical body of Christ," an organism which has continued in unbroken succession from the day of Pentecost down to the present time, that to it have been entrusted the word and sacraments, and the ministry of reconciliation, that the Holy Spirit honors these as the appointments and ordinances of Christ for the salvation of men, and that therefore salvation is to be found *in*, not *out of*, the Church, the Church Question was one of profound significance.

The only satisfactory vindication of Protestantism, with this

view of the Church, must be found in such historical development as will allow of great changes in the form of the Church, while at the same time its life continues to flow onward in unbroken succession. Room could be made in this way for Protestantism, which came, it is true, somewhat as St. Paul came among the Apostles, and claimed recognition as appointed and sent as truly as primitive and mediæval Christianity were appointed and sent by the Lord. As primitive Christianity contained the germs of mediæval Romanism, and so far forth authenticate this latter as a historical stadium of the Church, even with all its great evils, so mediæval Christianity contained the germs, swelling and breaking through all barriers, and budding with the new life, of Protestantism. Protestantism is no bastard, but the legitimate outgrowth of the deepest and best energies of the Church of the Middle Ages, and it inherited many of the features of its ancestry in the Primitive Church. The argument contained in these articles pressed to one of two conclusions therefore,—either the adoption of the Roman system, or else *pronounced*, though Churchly and conservative, Protestantism.* There could be no middle ground in repristination, or Puseyism. If the argument at times seemed to favor the Roman side, and speak slightly of Unchurchly Protestantism (for it is this phase of Protestantism that is mostly in the writer's eye), it must be remembered that the argument is purely historical, and does not profess the theory held by the writer. It

* There is, indeed, another alternative presented in the verbose and somewhat partisan argument of Isaac Taylor in his *Early Christianity*, viz., that the errors and evils of Romanism were in full blast in the primitive Church, so much so that in reference to some of these the mediæval Church was really a reformation of the early Church; and that, therefore, the primitive Church cannot be regarded as of any important authority. He comes, indeed, in one view, to the same conclusion as the articles on Early Christianity, but his argument turns all Christian history from the beginning into a grand apostasy, and tends to overthrow altogether the promise of Christ, "Lo, I am with you always," and "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her." If the Puseyites gave a rosy hue to primitive Christianity, certainly Taylor errs just as much in finding there only a mass of heresy and moral turpitude. As between these two the argument of Dr. Nevins must be commended for its faithfulness to history.

must be remembered, moreover, that the Synod never was called upon to endorse any particular phase of such historical argument. The conclusion in the Seminary and in the Church at large was the intelligent holding fast to the truly Protestant theory in the face of all that could be urged in the Puseyite movement in favor of an intermediate position between it and the theory of Romanism, and the Church became stronger for having gone through the trying ordeal connected with the historical argument. Judged by the lectures of Dr. Nevin in the class-room, and the writings of Dr. Schaff in his *Church History*, the Seminary stood soundly on the true Churchly Protestant theory. These lectures and this history are on record, and can be appealed to to substantiate what we have here said.

The Sacraments.

It was in connection with this dogma of the Church that the doctrine of the Sacraments came up for new consideration. The sacrament of baptism was not made the subject of formal controversy at this time, but its grace-bearing character was considered more in connection with the subject of Christian nurture and catechization. It was assumed and claimed for it that it is not an empty sign, nor merely the sign of a grace previously received.*

* "The communication of the Spirit, and consequently regeneration, in this case" (viz., of Cornelius), "before baptism, is striking and without parallel in the New Testament." Dr. Schaff, *Hist. Apos. Church*, p. 222. Nowhere in the Reformed Confessions can the theory be found, recently put forth by some in our Church, that baptism only confirms the grace of the covenant already conferred in natural birth from Christian parents. That would have been considered as bordering on Pelagianism.

See Article by Dr. E. V. Gerhart on The Doctrine of the Reformed Church on Holy Baptism, *Mercersburg Review*, April, 1868, in which the teaching of the Reformed Confessions is stated at length. The first Scotch Confession of 1560, Art. xxi., from which the article quotes a sentence, says: "And thus we utterly condemn the vanity of those, that affirm the Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs. No, we assuredly believe, that by baptism we are engrafted into Jesus Christ, to be made partakers of His justice, by the which our sins are covered and remitted."

More prominent, for a time, was the discussion of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The Church—our Church—and the Protestant Churches around us had generally settled down in the Zuinglian view, which allows no mystery in the sacrament, regarding it merely as a commemorative ordinance, and denying any real presence of the invisible grace, the body and blood of Christ. In vindication of the Calvinistic view of this holy sacrament, which was claimed to be the view incorporated into the Reformed Confessions generally, Dr. Nevin wrote his *Mystical Presence*, and defended it subsequently against Dr. Hodge, of Princeton, who maintained that Calvin's view was only an excrescence which the Reformed Confessions never adopted. In this controversy Dr. Nevin was in the right, and Dr. Hodge was in the wrong, as was abundantly shown by the historical testimony, and is abundantly apparent from an examination of the Reformed Confessions themselves. The teaching in the Seminary confined itself closely here to the Calvinistic view as contained in the Heidelberg Catechism. In the *Mystical Presence* an effort was made to supplement Calvin's *explanation* of the spiritual real presence with a more advanced Psychology and Philosophy. The idea of the *generic* life of Christ

Concerning which there is a naïve and amusing note by the editor of John Knox's History of the Reformation in Scotland, as follows:

"Here the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is plainly stated; and the Reformers seem to have gone to this extreme to avoid the scandal of holding the sacraments to be naked and bare signs. They had long been held in such superstitious and idolatrous veneration, that the Reformers could not shake themselves loose from the prevailing sentiment, which must have been early and deeply impressed on their minds, and therefore they could not look on these ordinances in their Scriptural simplicity: for what are they but signs, after all that has been said about them? They derive all their value from that which is signified by them; and the more naked and bare of every thing else the better, provided they be observed simply as Christ commanded. The article is improved in the Westminster Catechism. It does not say, that by baptism we are *ingrafted* into Christ as it is here; but baptism doth *signify* and *seal* our ingrafting into Christ. The account of the Lord's Supper, which follows in the same article, is extremely perplexed and wordy, which shows that the writer was laboring to express something that he did not distinctly understand."—Hist. of the Reformation in Scotland, by John Knox, edited by William McGavin, Esq. Second Edition. Glasgow, 1832.

and its dynamic presence in the Church is presented, as now held also by the Reformed and unionistic theologians of Germany. It was charged then that there has been an alarming falling away from the Reformed Confessions on this subject by a large portion of the Reformed Church. The charge may still be reiterated. We have been repeatedly told by Presbyterian ministers, and on one occasion by a Dutch Reformed minister, that in their judgment nine-tenths of the ministers in their respective denominations hold, not the Calvinistic, but the Zuinglian view of the Lord's Supper. In the Reformed Church in the United States there is scarcely a single minister who does not hold the view of Calvin and the Reformed Confessions, and not the Zuinglian. This is sufficient testimony, we think, that the teaching in the Seminary during the period we are speaking of, proved faithful to the original doctrine of the Reformed Church on this subject. And no one can for a moment think that the importance of this subject was not quite as great as it was then represented to be, without turning a large portion of the history of the Reformation into an unmeaning farce.

The Person of Christ.

Underlying the teaching on the dogma of the Church, but coming into prominence later in the public discussions of the professors, was the teaching in regard to the person of Christ. This refers not so much to the dogma of the constitution of the person of Christ as such, as it came to settlement in the early creeds, especially the formula of the Council of Chalcedon—but rather to the more practical question of the relation of Christ's divine-human person to God, to man and redemption. We can reach and state most briefly the teaching in the Seminary on this subject, perhaps, by beginning with the point, that Christ is not only the instrumental cause of redemption, but also and especially that He is the source of salvation for men. As sin entering through the first Adam had wrought a separation between man and God, the deepest significance of the in-

carnation lies in the fact that it brings man and God together again. In assuming humanity in His holy conception and birth of the Virgin Mary, He comes as the second Adam, first of all to work out redemption for man in His own person, and then and thus to be Himself in His glorified and undying life the source of redemption and life to men through the Holy Spirit. The fundamental fact for faith and for theology is the constitution of the person of Christ Himself as this confronts us in the incarnation. The humanity which He assumed was fallen, though sin was eliminated, that is, it was the human nature as He assumed it from the Virgin Mary, down the stream of our fallen life, and not that of Adam before the fall. He assumed it with all its antecedents and all its consequences. In His holy conception sin was eliminated, and in His unfolding life He repelled and overcame all sin at every point, and so through trial and suffering He moved onward to the final struggle with the consequences of sin in His atoning death upon the cross, where His redemptive work culminated; for there He made full satisfaction for man's sin by suffering the penalty due to him, and there He grappled with and overcame the last enemy, and arose triumphant in His resurrection from the dead. In all this there was a glorification of human life first in His own person. Heb. v. 7. He bore man's sin and guilt not by an outward imputation, but by virtue of His organic relation to the life of the world in His incarnation. The central idea of the atonement is to be found in this bringing together of God and man, at-one-ment, which includes then the truth in the other theories that the Church has from time to time put forth, while it excludes what is erroneous in them.

The old theory of the fathers, for instance, that Christ paid the penalty of death to the devil, has this in it, that in his death He contended against and overcame him that had the power of death, that is, the devil. The Anselmic view of a satisfaction for sin, is retained and held in so far as the death of Christ carried in it the penal consequences of man's sin. So,

too, Christ thus honored the law of God in His death, and God's moral government, and gave an exhibition of divine love. All these are here, but they are here, not as each one the whole of the atonement, not as propositions, but as elements that enter into the work of redeeming man by the Lord Jesus Christ.

When we ask how the redemption wrought out by Christ is applied, or made over to man, the answer here again is, in Christ. His life is the deepest substance of the new regenerate life of the believer. His glorified life mediated to man through the Holy Ghost, is the quickening power that raises the sinner from the dead, and makes him live forever. "Because I live ye shall live also."

Christ is the principle of Christianity. The kingdom or order of grace which He established, when He said, the kingdom of heaven is at hand, is just such an order of life as goes forth from Him, now glorified in the heavens, yet mystically present with His people always to the end of the world. As the breath of Adam is the breath of humanity, and his life their life, so the breathing upon man by Christ, is the breath of spiritual life. The humanity of Christ now glorified and become vivified through the Holy Ghost, is just as really the medium of His heavenly power and grace now, as when He confronted the disciples on earth, yea, more, because now it approaches in the Spirit.

Christ is the principle of theology. All creed centres in Him, and all right knowledge of God also, for He is the revealer of God, and no man can know God except in Him. True, the outward form or order of the theology taught at the time we are considering, was not changed, but at every point this account was made of the person of Christ. This is more than method. Dick's theology became informed with a new spirit. And this was made to appear all the more forcibly, because of the difference and contrast presented in the criticisms. With the utmost facility, all the dogmas were held in constant rela-

tion to the Christological principle, and it was as a new light flashing across the whole domain of the science. One may indeed wonder how Dr. Nevin could be content with the old outline, but the first work was to infuse life into the skeleton, that is, to bring the right principle to bear on every part. Theology took to itself the same principle as the Christian life; in the science it was Christological, in the sphere of Christian life, it was Christocentric.

It is not claimed that the introduction of this principle as central in theology, was original with the professors in the Seminary at Mercersburg. The papers on *The New Creation*, *Liebner's Christology*, *Wilberforce on the Incarnation*, *Cur Deus Homo*, and others, reveal in what close sympathy the Seminary was moving with the later German theology, and that of England. But it was reached and mastered by an originality and power, and earnestness of thought, which made it their own, in a deep sense, without anything like slavish dependence on any foreign system.

It would be interesting to trace the working of the Christological principle in the treatment of the several dogmas—the Trinity, Creation, Atonement, Justification; the last things, death, resurrection, etc., but our time will not allow, nor is it necessary before this body. We must pass on, to notice next the movement in

Philosophy,

which went hand in hand with the movement in theology at Mercersburg, and which enables us to bring forward now, a name which, it might seem, has thus far been kept too much in the back-ground—the name of Dr. Frederick Aug. Rauch,—whose monument stands in yonder Campus—and whose spirit we feel is with us to-day,—the first President of Marshall College. We refer to him here, not because he did not labor in the work of theological teaching, for he was a professor in the Seminary, but his chief work, I think we may say, consisted in leading

the way in the line of philosophic thought, which has stood in such close relation to our theology, and rendered it such good service.

Philosophy gives form to theology, while its contents are from divine revelation, just as Christianity originally employed the Greek language, in which to clothe its Scriptures and to express its great doctrines. The system of philosophy developed and taught in the institutions during this period, stood in intimate relation to the theology, and the one cannot be properly understood without the other.

"Dr. Rauch gave the first impulse to the prevailing system of thought. Possessing a mind of the finest mould, a graduate of the University of Marburg, a student of philosophy and theology in Giessen and Heidelberg, and subsequently professor of philosophy in these two celebrated universities, he came to this country a finished classical scholar, an erudite theologian, and a philosopher at once acute, profound, and Christian. Philosophy was his favorite sphere of study. 'He was at home in the philosophy of Great Britain, as well as that of Germany, and knew accurately the points of contact and divergency by which the relations of the two systems of thought to one another, generally considered, are characterized.' Becoming acquainted with American life and American modes of thought, he aimed as president of the College, at the development of an Anglo-German philosophy—not the simple transfer of German thoughts into the English language, but the living reproduction of the manifold truths of German systems in an English form, on the basis of a valid principle organically unfolded, and in the light of supernatural revelation."*

We can only refer to what we regard as some of the leading points in this philosophy, and that in very brief and general terms.

* Dr. Gerhart's Monograph, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan., 1863; where may be found also a presentation of the leading characteristics of the system begun by Dr. Rauch and developed by his successors.

In general, we may say it was an outgrowth of the later German philosophy, as contrasted with the English system of Locke and others, which wrought in the line of Deism and infidelity. The sensationalism of England, we know, has been superseded now in English-speaking countries, but we need not go back more than thirty years ago, to find it ruling the thinking in our American Colleges. At that time, Locke was the text-book in mental philosophy in Princeton College. The influence of this philosophy on theology—in general and on the understanding of the Reformation confessions, was immense. In regard, then, to

1. *The Relation of God to the Creation*, or, in philosophic terms, the absolute to the relative or the infinite to the finite, the philosophy taught in our institutions differed widely from the systems just referred to. The movement of philosophy in Germany took in the idea of the absolute, while the English systems shut it out, as, to a certain extent, Kant did, also. Leibnitz, Spinoza, Schelling, Fichte and Hegel wrought at this problem. They ran into error—they were pantheistic, as the English were Deistic—but there are elements in their systems which have obtained a standing in all the better thinking of the age. And this one—that the finite and relative stands in the absolute, is of far-reaching significance. There is, thus, an objective basis at hand for all thinking and science. That truth has an objective existence, and is not a mere deduction of the mind, that truth is absolute and relative,—this already is a light as through an open window for all science. In æsthetics it gives us the idea and the symbol, the infinite shining through the finite. In ethics it gives us the key-note in the idea of law in its universal character, as giving meaning to all laws, the general in the particular. The question here is not so much whether we can know the absolute, but whether we can acknowledge its presence and force in the finite. A philosophy that owns and accepts this, cannot indeed, lead us to God, that is not the calling or province of philosophy, but it can work in

harmony with Christian theology—which holds up for us that great word. In Him we live and move and have our being, the great truth with which St. Paul confronted the learning and culture of Athens.

2. Closely allied to this point, and in some sense one with it, is the *doctrine of realism* which animates the philosophic thinking of the Mercersburg School—the moderate realism expressed by the formula, *universalia in re*, according to which universals are regarded not as merely *afflatus vocis* or abstract names, which flit across the mind like vapory spectres, but objective entities. I cannot stop to show how far-reaching this is for science and philosophy—but it is apparent at once how important it is to help our thinking in theology. Take the idea of humanity in the explanation of original sin and organic redemption. How closely in sympathy we are here with the teaching of the Bible. What different views we have of imputation, whether of sin or of righteousness, as compared with that doctrine according to which only the individual and particular are real.

3. Shall I go on to name next the idea of the organic, and organic unity, so far reaching in the proper understanding of nature and natural science, then of history and Christian history, the history of the Church, and other topics that claim attention in theology? This idea now has a *habitat* in our American theology, but only a quarter of a century ago, before German thinking had yet found its way into our Colleges and Seminaries, it was strange and foreign. Even now there are outlying districts of theological thought into which it has not found entrance. And we know how generally with common theological thinkers organism is confounded with organization, so that when we plead for the idea of organic unity in the Church, we are understood to mean a mammoth organization, a consolidated denomination.

I might go on to illustrate how the philosophy—or philosophic thinking in our institutions wrought in harmony with the

theology—how it was used as a handmaid or help in reducing the mysteries of revelation to intelligible forms for the mind—but these must suffice. It was not just a finished system, it pinned its faith to no man or school, it eliminated the errors of German transcendentalism and pantheism, it underwent changes just because it was alive and moving, but it aimed to take in the deeply spiritual tendency of German thought, while it maintained its own independence, and did not overlook the good qualities of English thought.

EBRARD'S THEOLOGY UNDER DR. WOLFF.

I pass on to consider next the period of ten years during which Ebrard's *Dogmatics* was the text-book in theology under Dr. B. C. Wolff, and Dr. Schaff continued for most of the time to teach Church History and Exegesis. A considerable number of our ministers were educated during this time. Ebrard was not unknown to our Church before this. He had published a favorable article on the Mystical Presence, commending it heartily, and a work on the same subject, the Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist, in which he maintained the same position as Dr. Nevin. The introduction of his *Dogmatics* in the Seminary had advantages. It was a scholarly, scientific work by one who stood among the leading theologians of Germany, and he was Reformed. We have already said that Dr. Nevin felt himself called to another work than to methodize in theology. Under him it was a formative period when a sharply defined method might have detracted from that freedom which was necessary, and besides Dick was a standing testimony of the transition through which the Seminary had passed from the old to the new.

Ebrard in the main was in harmony with the previous teaching in the Seminary, with which Dr. Wolff was in close and intelligent sympathy. On the subject of the person of Christ and the Incarnation Ebrard's system strikes the same key-note, whose tones had already become so familiar in the Seminary.

Christ is the second Adam, who in His incarnation joined Himself with the stream of our fallen life, and became the source of a deuterio-Adamic life for the world. He teaches most distinctly the mystical union of the believer with Christ. The new birth with Him, as given in the thirty-third paragraph of his Practical Theology, is the real implantation of the glorified humanity of Christ into the centre of our psychical being, thus introducing into our human life the germ of a life heavenly and divine. He has no fear of pantheism in such an assertion. He is equally pronounced on the subject of the sacraments. While he in the main falls in with the idea of the Church previously taught in the Seminary—substituting as Dr. Nevin had done the distinction between the ideal and actual instead of the visible and invisible, yet he was not in full harmony here nor on the subject of the ministry, which is the weak point in all German theology, in part growing out of the want of independent Church organization there. So, too, while Ebrard is pronounced on baptism he differs somewhat from the views of the Seminary on infant baptism.

But this system, as already said, possessed many advantages over the English or Presbyterian systems, and in many points led to real progress in the Theological thinking of our Church. Although not studied as Dick had been, yet in the hands of Dr. Wolff, and under the general teaching in the Seminary, Ebrard's Dogmatics was not slavishly received, but complemented at certain points, while in the main it was entirely harmonious with the theological life there. In addition to his work in the Seminary Dr. Wolff furnished some interesting and valuable articles for the *Mercersburg Review* on Reformed Dogmatics, translated from Ebrard, in which the freedom of theology to advance instead of being tied to a procrustean bed is warmly advocated, as in harmony with the genius of the Reformed Church. No one Reformed symbol should be the full, absolute measure of the truth, in such sense as to take the place of the Scriptures, much less the theological systems of the centuries

that immediately followed the Reformation. Dr. Wolff, whose memory is cherished in our Reformed Church, and whose life was so largely devoted to the interests of the Seminary, both in its earlier and later history, exemplified this spirit in the freedom with which he himself advanced from the earlier to the later theological status of that Church which he so much loved. While he possessed a sound judgment, a conservative spirit, and an intelligent apprehension of the spirit of the Church, he also exerted a wholesome influence on the life of the Seminary, by reason of his practical experience in the work of the ministry, and his knowledge of the practical wants of the Church.

DRS. HARBAUGH AND HIGBEE.

When Dr. Wolff retired from the Seminary, and Dr. Harbaugh was called to his place, the teaching underwent only such modification as might be expected in a change of professors where the general system remains the same. Dr. Harbaugh already indicated the spirit which was to govern his teaching in his elaborate inaugural address, entitled *Christological Theology*. He was fully imbued with the spirit of the theology previously taught in the Seminary, had gone with it through its early struggles and trials, had supported and defended it in his writings and on the floor of Synod, and tested it in his preaching and labor as a pastor. With the flow of years it had undergone some modifications. The discussions of the Church question had reached their results. The Church had pretty much settled down in its own position, had attained a status. Many changes had also come over the theological culture of the Seminaries of the land. A broader and more catholic spirit had been infused into them by increased familiarity with the later German theological science. New England had its German teachers and German scholars now too. Some things which in earlier years had been looked upon with suspicion, as for instance the Apostles' Creed, were now becoming familiar on every side.

Dr. Harbaugh laid himself out especially to methodize and model our theology after the Christ idea. And for this he had some special qualifications. He was a good thinker, a good organizer, and a fluent writer. He had become a hard worker and a distinguished author. He did not shrink from the task of attempting to *organize* our theology, as he spoke of it. With the elaborate system of Lange, as somewhat of a help and guide he entered upon his work, and within the short space of four years he had his course of lectures on Dogmatic and Practical Theology fully wrought out, though not finally revised, when he was called away from his labors by the hand of death. A peculiarity of his system is that he employed the Christ idea to rule in the beginning of his system, in treating of the being and nature of God. His view was that the consciousness of God primarily posits God in Christ, as shown in the anthropomorphic conceptions of God, everywhere dimly revealed in all religions, and that there is an eternal ideal humanity in the Logos, pointing to the form in which God revealed Himself in the incarnation.

His theology is especially rich and glowing with life-fervor in the Christological section proper, which treats of the person of Christ, His incarnation, the infancy and development of the God-man, &c. His mystical and poetic tendency clothed these subjects with unusual interest, and brought out deep undertones in the symbolism of the Infant Word. The material had been wrought out in the previous work performed in the Seminary—there was no special demand for originality here, nor did he aim at it; but in organizing the material at hand, and presenting it in a way that mediated it for the grasp and apprehension of the student, he was eminently successful. His previous studies had prepared him to develop in its fulness the idea of Cultus—and his lectures on Catechetics were elaborate.

The department of Church History and Exegesis was ably filled by Dr. Higbee. He brought both scholarship and industry to bear in giving life and interest to the science which had been

so ably taught by Dr. Schaff. He too was imbued with the spirit of our theology, as it had advanced step by step through its trials and struggles from its formative period, and this spirit became a light for the pages of the Church's history, which were made to glow with interest and animation at every point, as by the skill of a master workman. The Seminary was highly prosperous under these able and diligent professors, and the teaching was now rendered the more efficient, by the addition of a third teacher or tutor, a department established already in connection with their immediate predecessors. The first Tutors were Revs. W. M. Reily and Jacob B. Kerschner, who both, after a full course of literary and theological study in this country, spent several years in the Universities in Germany, in order to prepare themselves for their work. Their labors in the Seminary were of immense value, in keeping up a high grade of scholarship, and enabling the other professors to enlarge their labors in their separate departments. The third Tutor was Rev. Frederick A. Gast, who is now a full professor in the Seminary.

We have said that during this period the Seminary enjoyed greater calm than in its earlier years. The great discussions were substantially over. True, the agitation on the question of the liturgy was stirring the Church, but this was not directly a Seminary matter. The Synod had prepared the liturgy, and the responsibility rested with it. The discussions on the Church Question, if they had not settled all they expected or proposed, had at any rate exhausted their strength, and revealed more clearly what could not be settled except in the way of history.

Among some of the changes that had taken place in the theology whose history we have been narrating, this was one. It was not just a change in the original premises or principles, for these, as we have seen, were antagonistic to the claims of Rome and Oxford, as well as to rationalism and sectarianism from the beginning. But there was a period when the evils of Protestantism were emphasized, and an isolated position to a

considerable extent was assumed in relation to other Protestant denominations around us. The necessity for that had largely passed away. The evils of Protestantism are not to be overcome by any sudden movement or work. History must take its time to do that. There were indications favorable to a tendency in the right direction. The movements towards union began to possess a life that was unknown before. Sectarianism was not defended as a good thing as it had been.

Our own Church had reached a more independent position. At first we were fighting for this inch by inch. Other bodies would have patronized us—provided we would consent to hang on by their skirts. We had outgrown that. It was felt that we could fraternize and mingle freely with Churches around us, without compromising our independent standing.

Then in relation to Romanism, changes had taken place, which modified somewhat the attitude assumed before. Romanism has moved on to something like a *reductio ad absurdum*. Instead of enlarging its spirit and softening its tone towards Protestantism, it has exceeded the violence of Trent, and established the most extreme ultramontaniam.

We say changes had taken place, but they were changes that maintained the first principles and premises, while foibles were left behind, and a more advanced standing was obtained. And why should it not be so? To fix upon the precise mode of thought, and the particulars of theological teaching at one time, say thirty years ago, and look to it as a fixed standard for all subsequent time, would be slavery, not freedom. During those later years the Church was studied more, perhaps, in the light of the Christ idea. The storms of controversy in England, Germany, and America, on this subject had concentrated special thought on the one feature of the Church, and in a calmer time this would assume more natural proportions. True, Christ is in His Church as His mystical body, and in one sense the Church idea is the Christ idea, but a proper distinction between the ideal and the actual Church, or Christianity and the Church,

must serve to modify an ecclesiasticism to which our theology was never willing to commit itself. It is not to be wondered at that something of one-sidedness should attach to a movement so deep, so earnest, and involving so great an advance on the old as was the case with the theology whose history we have been considering. That its history was even attended with great dangers, and some loss, was natural.

All great truths stand near to corresponding great errors. A movement which is historical, as this was, not only with us, but in England and Germany as well, would likely give occasion to some to carry it to an extreme. In the Reformation the anabaptistic sects pressed on beyond where Luther was willing to go, and in England Newman, Wilberforce and Manning passed beyond the venerable Pusey. In our own Church some have not been willing to move with history, but sought to anticipate it, and cut the Gordian knot. The Seminary may be said to have furnished the occasion for this one-sidedness, because it brought forward earnestly the Church Question, but it was not the cause. It continues to stand firmly in the true faith of the Protestant Reformation, though it refuses to be slavishly bound by any human tradition, whether from Pope or Reformers.

Here we propose to stop in our history, leaving the present status of teaching in the Seminary to be judged by those whom Synod appoints to superintend it, to the young men who go out from its walls, and to the historian who shall hereafter write or comment on our history.

I shall detain you a few moments longer while in conclusion I refer briefly to some of the good fruits which the teaching in the Seminary for the last half century has produced for our Church.

The number of ministers the Seminary has furnished to the Church belongs to its external history, but we may refer, as belonging to our subject, to the principles and animus of their work.

1. Take first the subject of Catechization and Christian nurture. Never was there a time in the history of our Church in this country, when the work of catechization was so faithfully and earnestly attended to as during the time of the Seminary's history, especially after the first decade. And the Church has abundantly prospered under these labors. We are not called to condemn other modes, they may accomplish good for Christ too, but for our Church we cling to that which was so prominent a feature in all the Church work in the Palatinate in the first period of our Church life. Never before was the Heidelberg Catechism more exalted in the faith of the Church and its use more faithful. It has not been idolized. It is not perfect, for it is a human production. It has defects—it is not heresy nor disloyalty to say that; but it has been highly honored in its use by the young men that have gone out from the Seminary, and the Church has reaped a rich and lasting benefit.

2. It has rehabilitated the Church festivals and the order of the Church year in such a way as to give them a real spiritual power in the Church. A sacred year is just as necessary for Christianity as the weekly sacred season. It has characterized the history of the Church from the beginning, in reference to two yearly festivals at least, going back to the age of the Apostles. The original Reformation did not cast these off, but only aimed here as elsewhere to clear away Romish abuses. The late developments in the secondary movements after the Reformation went farther, and did away with all sacred days except Sunday—which, itself, however, is a Christian festival. Our Church, before the life of the Seminary began to be felt, in the English portions had lost this feature of Christian Cultus, and even where retained, it was in a sort of traditional spirit only. But the views of Christianity, disseminated by the Seminary, have made this feature something that has life. The influence goes out for good among our congregations, and has already done much to inspire our Sunday Schools. It lays hold of the young men and becomes an immense power to bind them to the mysteries of our holy religion.

3. It has infused new life into the ordinary forms of Church service and government. According to the individualistic theory of Christianity these have but little real significance. Individual experience is magnified above the life of the Church. Each side has its rights. But with the view of the Church and her ordinances that has come to us through the teaching of the Seminary, the one is made to stand properly in the other. The worship of the sanctuary is a real transaction, in which God comes to man and man meets God. The powers of the Church in its government and discipline are realities according to our Saviour's word—"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Synodical and classical authority is respected. The spirit of independence is passing away, and with all our theological discussions, the consciousness of Church unity has held us bound together, while other bodies have succumbed and broken into fragments.

Time would fail me to speak of the richness and freshness that have been given to Christianity in the views and feelings of our people, to the incarnation and life and death of Christ, to His resurrection and ascension, to the deep significance of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit—the founding of the Church and the means of grace—the nearness of Christ in His mystical presence with all believers. A system that has helped us as a Church to such spiritual views of our holy religion, that has given us such a strong position over against various forms of error, should be sacredly cherished. It has its defects, its faults; let these be overcome and corrected, but may the day never come when the Reformed Church in these United States, under the influence of any denunciations or persuasions, come from what quarter they may, shall cast from it this system as a whole. But may this Synod continue to cherish it in the future as it has cherished it in the past, as a great and glorious heritage for our beloved Reformed Zion! The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all! Amen!

ART. III.—THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D.

A CHAPTER FROM HIS FORTHCOMING "HISTORY OF THE CREEDS OF CHRISTENDOM," TO BE PUBLISHED IN 3 VOLS.

Literature. I. Standard Editions of the Catechism.

OFFICIAL German editions of 1563 (three), 1585, 1595, 1684, 1724, 1863 (American.) The original title is "Catechismus | Oder | Christlicher Unterricht, | wie der in Kirchen und Schu- | len der Churfürstlichen | Pfalz getrieben | wirdt. | Gedruckt in der Churfürstlichen Stadt Heidelberg, durch | Johannem Mayer. | M. D. LXIII." With the Electoral arms. 95 pages.

There is but one copy of the first edition known to exist, and this did not come into public notice till 1864. It belonged to Prof. Hermann Wilken, of Heidelberg, whose name it bears, with the date 1563; was bought by Dr. Treviranus, of Bremen, in 1823, given by him to Dr. Menken, bought back after Menken's death, 1832, and is now in the University Library at Utrecht. I examined it in October and November, 1865, at Bremen. It has the remark, "*Dieses ist die allererste Edition, in welcher Pag. 55 die 80te Frag und Antwort nicht gefunden wirdt. Auff Churfürstlichen Befehl eingezogen. Liber Rarissimus.*" The Scripture texts are quoted in the margin, but only the chapters, since the versicular division (which first appeared in Stephens's Greek Testament of 1551) had not yet come into general use. A quasi fac-simile of this copy was issued by the Rev. ALBRECHT WOLTERS, then at Bonn (now at Halle), under the title, "*Der Heidelberger Catechismus in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, herausgegeben nebst der Geschichte seines Textes im Jahre 1563.*" Bonn (Ad. Marcus), 1864.

NIEMEYER, in his collection of Reformed Confessions, pp. 390 sqq., gives, besides the Latin text, a faithful reprint of the third German edition, with the eightieth question in full.

PHILIP SCHAFF: *Der Heidelberger Catechismus. Nach der ersten Ausgabe von 1563 revidirt und mit kritischen Anmerkungen, sowie einer Geschichte und Charakteristik des Catechismus versehen.* Philadelphia (J. Kohler), 1863; second edition, revised and enlarged, 1866. This edition was prepared for the tercentenary celebration of the Heidelberg Catechism, and gives the received text of the third edition with the readings of the first and second editions, and the Scripture proofs in full.

The Latin translation was published in 1563, and again in 1566, under the title, "CATE- | CHESIS RELIGIONIS CHRISTIANÆ, | qua traditur in Ecclesiis | et Scholis Palatinatus | Heidelbergæ. | Excusum anno post Christum | natum M. D. LXVI." I saw a copy of this ed. Latina in the library of the late Dr. Treviranus in Bremen (1865). On the title-page the words are written, "*Editio rara et originalis;*" also the name of G. Menken, the former owner. The Scripture references are marked on the margin, including the verses. The eightieth question is complete (with "*execranda idololatria*") pp. 62 and 63, and supported by many

Scripture texts and the *Can. Missæ*. The questions are divided into fifty-two Sundays. "*Precationes aliquot privatae et publicæ*," a "*Precatio scholastica*," and some versified prayers of Joachim Camerarius (the friend and biographer of Melancthon), are added.

The best *English*, or rather *American*, edition of the Catechism is the stately triglot tercentenary edition prepared at the direction of the German Reformed Church in the United States, by a committee consisting of E. V. Gerhart, D.D., John W. Nevin, D.D., Henry Harbaugh, D.D., John S. Kessler, D.D., Daniel Zacharias, D.D., and three laymen, and issued under the title, "*The Heidelberg Catechism, in German, Latin, and English with an Historical Introduction* (by Dr. Nevin), New York (Charles Scribner), 1863." 4to. The German text is a reprint of the third edition after Niemeyer, with the German in modern spelling added; the English translation is made directly from the German original, and is far better than the one in popular use, which was made from the Latin. It is the most elegant and complete edition of the Catechism ever published, but it appeared before the discovery of the *editio princeps*, and repeats the error concerning the eightieth question (see *Introd.* p. 38).

II. COMMENTARIES.

The commentaries and sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism are exceedingly numerous, especially in the German and Dutch languages. The first and most, valuable is from the chief author, ZACH. URSINUS: *Corpus Doctrinæ orthodoxæ, or Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*, ed. by his pupil, DAVID PAREUS, and repeatedly published at Heidelberg and elsewhere—1591, 1618, etc.—in Latin, German, Dutch, and English. An American edition, on the basis of the English translation of Bishop Dr. H. PARRY, was issued by Dr. WILLIARD (President of Heidelberg College, Tiffin, O.), Columbus, O., 1850. Other standard commentaries are by COCCEJUS (1671), D'OUTREIN (1719), LAMPE (1720), STÄHELIN (1724) and VAN ALPEN (1800). See a fuller list by HARBAUGH in *Mercersburg Review* for 1860, pp. 601-625, and at the close of Bethune's *Lectures*, vol. I.

Of more recent works we name—

KARL SUDHOFF: *Theologisches Handbuch zur Auslegung des Heidelberger Catechismus*. *Frankf. a. M.* 1862.

GEO. W. BETHUNE (D.D., and minister of the Reformed Dutch Church, New York; (d. at Florence, 1862): *Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism*. New York, 1864, 2 vols.

HERMANN DALTON (Ger. Ref. minister at St. Petersburg): *Immanuel. Der Heidelberger Katechismus als Bekenntniss und Erbauungsbuch der evangelischen Kirche erklärt und an's Herzgelegt*. Wiesbaden, 1870.

III. HISTORICAL WORKS.

H. ALTING (Prof. of Theology at Heidelberg and Gröningen, d. 1644): *Historia Ecclesiæ Palatinæ*. *Frankf. a. M.* 1701.

B. G. STRUVE: *Pfälzische Kirchenhistorie*. *Frankf.* 1721, Ch. V. sqq.

D. L. WUNDT: *Grundriss der pfälzischen Kirchengeschichte bis zum Jahr.* 1742. *Heidelb.* 1798.

JAQUES LENFANT: *L'innocence du Catéchisme de Heidelberg*. *Heidelb.* 1688 (1723).

J. CHR. KÖCHER: *Katechetische Geschichte der Reformirten Kirche, sonderlich der Schicksale des Heidelberger Katechismi.* Jena, 1766, pp. 237-344.

G. J. PLANCK: *Geschichte der Protestantischen Theologie von Luther's Tode, etc.* Vol. II. Part II. pp. 475-491. (This is vol. V. of his great work on the *Geschichte der Entstehung, etc., unseres protestant. Lehrbegriffs.*)

HEINR. SIMON VAN ALPEN: *Geschichte u. Literatur des Heidelb. Katechismus.* Frankf. a. M. 1800. Vol. III. Part II. (The first two volumes and the first part of the third volume of this catechetical work contain explanations and observations on the Catechism, which are, however, semi-rationalistic.)

JOH. CHR. W. AUGUSTI: *Versuch einer hist.-kritischen Einleitung in die beiden Haupt-Katechismen (the Luth. and Heidelb.) der evangelischen Kirche.* Elberfeld, 1824, pp. 96 sqq.

RIENÄCKER: Article on the Heidelb. Catechism in *Erach und Gruber, Allgem. Encyklop.* Sect. II. Part IV. pp. 386 sqq.

LUDWIG HÄUSSER: *Geschichte der Rhein-Pfalz.* Heidelb. 1845. Vol. II.

D. SEISEN: *Geschichte der Reformation zu Heidelberg, von ihren ersten Anfängen bis zur Abfassung eis Heidelb. Katechismus. Eine Denkschrift zur dreihundertjährigen Jubelfeier daselbst am 3. Jan. 1846.* Heidelb. 1846.

AUG. EBRARD: *Das Dogma vom heil. Abendmahl und seine Geschichte.* Frankfurt a. M. 1846. Vol. II. pp. 575 sqq.

K. FR. VIERORDT: *Geschichter der Reformation im Grossherzogthum. Baden. Nach grossentheils handschriftlichen Quellen.* Karlsruhe, 1847.

JOHN W. NEVIN: *History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism.* Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. (The best work on the Catechism in English.) Comp. Dr. NEVIN's able Introduction to the triglot tercentenary edition of the H. C. New York, 1863, pp. 11-127.

KARL SUDHOFF: *C. Olevianus und Z. Ursinus. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften.* Elberfeld, 1357.

G. D. J. SCHOTEL: *History of the Origin, Introduction, and Fortunes of the Heidelberg Catechism* (in Dutch). Amsterdam, 1863.

Several valuable essays on the Heidelberg Catechism, by PLITT, SACK, and ULLMANN, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863.

TERCENTENARY MONUMENT. *In Commemoration of the Three Hundredth Anniversary of the Heidelberg Catechism.* Published by the German Reformed Church of the United States of North America, in English and German. The German ed. by Dr. SCHAFF, with an historical introduction. Chambersburg and Philadelphia, Pa., 1863. This work contains about twenty essays, by European and American theologians, on the history and theology of the Heidelberg Catechism.

J. I. DEDDES (Prof. at Utrecht): *De Heidelbergse Catechismus in ziene eerste Levensjaren* 1563-1567. *Historische en Bibliografische Nalezing met 26 Fac-similes.* Utrecht, 1867 (pp. 154). Very valuable for the early literary history of the H. C., with fac-similes of the first German, Latin, and Dutch editions.

THE REFORMATION IN THE PALATINATE.

The Palatinate, one of the finest provinces of Germany, on both sides of the upper Rhine, was one of the seven electorates

(*Kurfürstenthümer*), whose rulers, in the name of the German people, elected the Emperor of Germany. After the dissolution of the old empire (1806) it ceased to be a politico-geographical name, and its territory is now divided between Baden, Bavaria, Hesse Darmstadt, Nassau, and Prussia. Its capital was Heidelberg (from 1231 till 1720), famous for its charming situation at the foot of the *Königstuhl*, on the banks of the Swabian river Neckar, for its picturesque castle, and for its university (founded in 1346).

Luther made a short visit to Heidelberg in 1518, and defended certain evangelical theses. In 1546, the year of Luther's death, the Reformation was introduced under the Elector Frederick II. Melancthon, who was a native of the Palatinate, and twice received a call to a professorship of theology at Heidelberg (1546 and 1557), but declined, acted as the chief counselor in the work, and aided, on a personal visit in 1557, in reorganizing the university on an evangelical basis under Otto Henry (1556-59). He may therefore be called the Reformer of the Palatinate. He impressed upon it the character of a moderate Lutheranism friendly to Calvinism. The Augsburg Confession was adopted as the doctrinal basis, and the cultus was remodeled (as also in the neighboring Duchy of Wurtemberg) after Zwinglian simplicity. Heidelberg now began to attract Protestant scholars from different countries, and became a battle-ground of Lutheran, Philippist, Calvinist, and Zwinglian views. The conflict was enkindled as usual by the zeal for the real presence. Tilemann Heshusius, whom Melancthon, without knowing his true character, had recommended to a theological chair (1558), introduced, as General Superintendent, exclusive Lutheranism, excommunicated Deacon Klebitz for holding the Zwinglian view, and even fought with him at the altar about the communion cup. This public scandal was the immediate occasion of the Heidelberg Catechism.

FREDERICK III.

During this controversy FREDERICK III., surnamed the Pious (1515-1576), became the elector of the Palatinate, 1559. He made it the chief object of his reign to carry out the reformation begun by his predecessors. He tried at first to conciliate the parties, and asked the advice of Melanchthon, who, a few months before his death, counseled peace, moderation, and Biblical simplicity, and warned against extreme and scholastic subtleties in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper.* He deposed both Heshusius and Klebitz, arranged a public disputation (June, 1560) on the eucharist, decided in favor of the Melanchthonian or Calvinistic view, called distinguished foreign divines to the university, and intrusted two of them with the composition of the Heidelberg Catechism, which was to secure harmony of teaching and to lay a solid foundation for the religious instruction of the rising generation.

Frederick was one of the purest and noblest characters among the princes of Germany. He was to the Palatinate what King Alfred and Edward VI. were to England, what the Electors Frederick the Wise and John the Constant were to Saxony, and Duke Christopher to Würtemberg. He did more for educational and charitable institutions than all his predecessors. He devoted to them the entire proceeds of the oppressed convents. He lived in great simplicity that he might contribute liberally from his private income to the cause of learning and religion. He was the first German prince who professed the Reformed Creed, as distinct from the Lutheran. For this he suffered much reproach, and was threatened with exclusion from the benefits of the Augsburg Treaty of Peace (concluded in 1555), since Zwinglianism and Calvinism were not yet

* *Responsio Ph. Mel. ad questionem de controversia Heidelbergensi* (Nov. 1, 1559), in *Corp. Reform.* Vol. IX. pp. 960 sqq. It is the last public utterance of Melanchthon on the eucharistic question, and agrees substantially with the doctrine of Calvin, as it was afterward expressed in the Heidelberg Catechism.

tolerated on German soil. But at the Diet of Augsburg, in 1566, he made before the Emperor a manly confession of his faith, and declared himself ready to lose his crown rather than violate his conscience. Even his opponents could not but admire his courage, and the Lutheran Elector Augustus of Saxony, applauded him, saying, "Fritz, thou art more pious than all of us." He praised God on his death-bed that he had been permitted to see such a reformation in Church and school that men were led away from human traditions to Christ and His divine Word. He left in writing a full confession of his faith, which may be regarded as an authentic explanation of the Heidelberg Catechism; it was published after his death by his son, John Casimir (1577).

URSINUS AND OLEVIANUS.

Frederick showed his wisdom by calling two young divines, Ursinus and Olevianus, to Heidelberg to aid in the Reformation and to prepare an evangelical catechism. They belong to the reformers of the second generation. Theirs it was to nurture and to mature rather than to plant. Both were Germans, but well acquainted with the Reformed Churches in Switzerland and France. Both suffered deposition and exile for the Reformed faith.

ZACHARIAS URSINUS (BÄR), the chief author of the Heidelberg Catechism, was born at Breslau, July 18, 1534, and studied seven years (1550-1557) at Wittenberg under Melancthon, who esteemed him as one of his best pupils and friends. He accompanied his teacher to the religious conference at Worms, 1557, and to Heidelberg, and then proceeded on a literary journey to Switzerland and France. He made the personal acquaintance of Bullinger and Peter Martyr at Zurich, of Calvin and Beza at Geneva, and was thoroughly initiated into the Reformed Creed. Calvin presented him with his works, and wrote in them the best wishes for his young friend. On his return to Wittenberg he received a call to the rectorship of the Elizabeth College at Breslau. After the death of Melancthon-

thou he went a second time to Zurich (Oct. 1560), intending to remain there. In the following year he was called to a theological chair at Heidelberg. Here he labored with untiring zeal and success till the death of Frederick III., 1576, when, together with six hundred steadfast Reformed ministers and teachers, he was deposed and exiled by Louis VI., who introduced the Lutheran Creed. Ursinus found a refuge at Neustadt an der Hardt, and established there, with other deposed professors, a flourishing theological school under the protection of John Casimir, the second son of Frederick III. He died in the prime of his life and usefulness, March 6, 1583, leaving a widow and one son. In the same year Casimir succeeded his Lutheran brother in the Electorate, recalled the exiled preachers, and re-established the Reformed Church in the Palatinate.

Ursinus was a man of profound classical, philosophical, and theological learning, poetic taste, rare gift of teaching, and fervent piety. His devotion to Christ is beautifully reflected in the first question of the Heidelberg Catechism, and in his saying that he would not take a thousand worlds for the blessed assurance of being owned by Jesus Christ. He was no orator, and no man of action, but a retired, modest, and industrious student.* His principal works, besides the Catechism, are a Commentary on the Catechism (*Corpus doctrinæ orthodoxæ*) and a defense of the Reformed Creed against the attacks of the Lutheran Formula of Concord.

CASPER OLEVIANUS (OLEWIG), born at Treves, Aug. 10, 1536, studied the ancient languages at Paris, Bourges, and Orleans, and theology at Geneva and Zurich. He enjoyed, like Ursinus, the personal instruction and friendship of the surviving reformers of Switzerland. He began to preach the evangelical doctrines at Treves, was thrown into prison, but soon released, and called to Heidelberg, 1560, by Frederick III., who felt under personal obligation to him for saving one

* On the door of his study he inscribed the warning, "*Amice, quisquis huc venit, aut agita paucis, aut abi, aut melaborantem adjuva.*"

of his sons from drowning at the risk of his own life. He taught theology and preached at the court. He was the chief counsellor of the Elector in all affairs of the Church. In 1576, he was banished on account of his faith, and accepted a call to Herborn, 1584, where he died, Feb. 27, 1585. His last word was a triumphant "*certissimus*," in reply to a friend who asked him whether he was certain of his salvation. Theodore Beza lamented his death in a Latin poem, beginning

*"Eheu, quibus suspiriis,
Eheu, quibus te lacrymis,
Olevianus, planzero!"*

Olevianus was inferior to Ursinus in learning, but his superior in the pulpit and in church government. He wrote an important catechetical work on the covenant of grace, and is regarded as the forerunner of the federal theology of Cocceus and Lampe. He labored earnestly, but only with moderate success, for the introduction of the Presbyterian form of government and a strict discipline, after the model of Geneva. Thomas Erastus (Lieber), Professor of Medicine at Heidelberg, and afterwards of Ethics at Basle (died 1583), opposed excommunication, and defended the supremacy of the state in matters of religion; hence the term "Erastianism" (equivalent to Cæsaropapism).

PREPARATION AND PUBLICATION OF THE CATECHISM.

The HEIDELBERG Catechism, as it is called after the city of its birth, or the PALATINATE (also PALATINE) Catechism, as it is named after the country for which it is intended, was prepared on the basis of two Latin drafts of Ursinus and a German draft of Olevianus. The peculiar gifts of both, the didactic clearness and precision of the one, and the pathetic warmth and unction of the other, were blended in beautiful harmony, and produced a joint work which is far superior to all the separate productions of either. In the Catechism they surpassed themselves. They were in a measure inspired for it. At the same time, they made free and independent use of the Catechisms of

Calvin, Lasky, and Bullinger. The Elector took the liveliest interest in the preparation.

In December, 1562, Frederick submitted the work to a general synod of the chief ministers and teachers assembled at Heidelberg, for revision and approval. It was published early in 1563, in German, under the title "*Catechismus, or Christian Instruction, as conducted in the Churches and Schools of the Electoral Palatinate.*"* It is preceded by a short preface of the Elector, dated Tuesday, January 19, 1563, in which he informs the superintendents, clergymen, and school-masters of the Palatinate that, with the counsel and co-operation of the theological faculty and leading ministers of the Church, he had caused to be made and set forth a summary instruction or Catechism of our Christian religion from the Word of God, to be used hereafter in churches and schools for the benefit of the rising generation.

THE THIRD EDITION AND THE EIGHTIETH QUESTION.

There appeared, in the year 1563, three official editions of the Catechism with an important variation in the eightieth question which denounces the Romish mass as "a denial of the one sacrifice of Christ, as an accursed idolatry." In the first edition this question was wanting altogether: the second edition has it in part; the third in full, as it now stands.† This question was inserted by the express command of the Elector, perhaps by his own hand, as a Protestant counter-blast to the Romish anathemas of the Council of Trent, which closed its sessions Dec. 4, 1563. Hence the remark at the end of the second and third editions: "What has been overlooked in the first print, as especially on folio 55 [which contains the eightieth question], has now been added by command of his electoral grace. 1563."

* See the original title in the literature above.

† Before the discovery and examination of the only remaining copy of the first edition (in 1864) there was a difference of opinion on the origin of the eightieth question, which is now satisfactorily settled. See the details in my tercentenary edition, pp. 106-115, also the note on the eightieth question in Vol. III. p. 326.

The same view of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass was generally entertained by the Reformers, and is set forth as strongly in the Articles of Smalcald and other symbolical books, both Lutheran and Reformed. It must be allowed to remain as a solemn protest against idolatry. But the wisdom of inserting controversial matter into a catechism for the instruction of the youth has been justly doubted. The eightieth question disturbs the peaceful harmony of the book, it rewards evil for evil, it countenances intolerance, which is un-Protestant and unevangelical. It provoked much unnecessary hostility, and led even, under the Romish rule of the Elector Charles Philip, in 1719, to the prohibition of the Catechism; but the loud remonstrance of England, Prussia, Holland, and other Protestant states forced the Elector to withdraw the tyrannical decree within a year, under certain conditions, to save appearances.

TRANSLATIONS.

The Heidelberg Catechism was translated into all the European and many Asiatic languages. It has the pentecostal gift of tongues in a rare degree. It is stated that, next to the Bible, the "Imitation of Christ," by Thomas à Kempis, and Bunyan's "Pilgrim's Progress," no book has been more frequently translated, more widely circulated and used. Whole libraries of paraphrases, commentaries, sermons, attacks, and defenses were written about it. In many Reformed churches, especially in Holland (and also in the United States), it was and is to some extent even now obligatory or customary to explain the Catechism from the pulpit every Sunday afternoon. Hence the division of the questions into fifty-two Sundays, in imitation of the example set by Calvin's Catechism.*

* This division was first introduced in the Latin edition of 1566, perhaps earlier. Van Alpen, Niemeyer, and others are wrong in dating it from the German edition of 1573 or 1575.

A Latin translation, for the use of colleges, was made by order of the Elector, by JOSHUA LAGUS and LAMBERT LUDOLPH PITHOPÆUS, and appeared soon after the German, since Ole-vianus sent a copy of each to Bullinger, in Zurich, as early as April, 1563.* It is, however, much inferior to the German in force and unction. The Latin text was often edited separately as well as in the works of Ursinus, in connection with his commentary and other Latin commentaries, and in collections of Reformed symbols.†

There are three Dutch translations: the first appeared at Emden, 1563; the second, by PETER DATHENUS, in connection with a Dutch version of the Psalter, in 1566, and very often separately.‡

A Greek translation was prepared by a distinguished classical scholar, D. FRID. SYLBURG, 1597.§

Besides these there are editions in modern Greek, in Hebrew, Arabic, etc.||

* Dœdes gives a fac-simile of the title-page of the Latin edition of 1563, from a copy in the University Library at Utrecht. It is nearly the same as the title of the edition of 1566, given in the literature above.

† Niemeyer (pp. 428 sqq.) reproduces the edition of 1584, which agrees with the *ed. princeps* of 1563 (as far as I can judge from the few fac-simile pages given by Dœdes), and with the text in the Oxford *Sylloge*, while that in the Græco-Latin edition of Sylburg slightly differs. Dr. Louis H. Steiner, of Frederick City, Md., published an elegant and accurate edition under the title "*Catechesis Religionis Christianæ seu Catechismus Heidelbergensis*. Baltimore, 1862." He gives the variations of three Latin editions: of Cambridge, 1585; of Geneva, 1609 (formerly in the possession of Chevalier Bunsen); and the Oxford *Sylloge*, 1804.

‡ On the Dutch translations, see especially the learned work of Professor Dœdes, of Utrecht, pp. 74-128, with fac-similes at the end of the volume.

§ I have before me a Græco-Latin edition of the Catechism (*κατεχέσεις τῆς χριστιανικῆς θρησκείας*), by Sylburg, and of the Belgic Confession by Jac. Revius, printed at Utrecht, 1660. Earlier editions I see noticed in catalogues.

|| Niemeyer (*Proleg.* p. lxii.) mentions a Polish translation by *Prasmovius*, a Hungarian by *Scarasius*, an Arabic by *Chelius*, a Singalese by *Konyer*, besides French, Italian, Spanish, English, Bohemian, modern Greek, and Hebrew versions. Dœdes (p. 41) adds a Persian and Malayan translation. There are no doubt many other versions.

Three or four English translations were made from the Latin, and obtained a wide circulation in Scotland, England, and America.* A more correct one from the German original was prepared for the tercentenary celebration of the Catechism, by a learned and able committee appointed by the German Reformed Synod in Pennsylvania, but has not yet come into public use.†

The merits of the Latin and English translations, and their relation to the German original, may be seen from the following specimens :

THE GERMAN ORIGINAL, 1563.

Frage 1. Was ist dein einziger Trost im Leben und im Sterben?

Daß ich mit Leib und Seele, beides im Leben und im Sterben, nicht mein, sondern meines getreuen Heilandes Jesu Christi eigen bin, der mit seinem theuren Blute für alle meine Sünden vollkommen bezahlt, und

THE LATIN VERSION, 1563.

Qu. 1. *Quæ est unica tua consolatio in vita et in morte?*

Quod animo pariter et corpore, sive vivam, sive moriar, non meus, sed fidei-ssimi Domini et Servatoris mei Jesu Christi sua proprius, qui pretioso sanguine suo pro omnibus peccatis meis

* An English edition, without the name of the translator, appeared A. D., 1591 at Edinburgh, "by publick Authority, for the Use of Scotland," and also repeatedly in connection with the "Psalm-Book and the Book of Common Order." It is embodied in Dunlop's *Collection of Confessions of Faith, etc., of publick authority in the Church of Scotland* (Edinburgh, 1719-1722), Vol. II. pp. 273-361, and reproduced by Dr. Horatius Bonar in his *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation* (London, 1866), pp. 112-170. Dr. Bonar says (p. 171): "There are several translations of the Heidelberg or Palatine Catechism; and our Church [the Church of Scotland] seems not to have kept to one. In the edition of the Book of Common Order before us (1615) the Catechism is given alone; in that which Dunlop has followed, it has the 'Arguments' and 'Uses' of Bastingius." Another translation by Bishop HENRY PARRY, of Worcester (d. 1616), appeared (together with the commentary of Ursinus) at Oxford, 1509 and 1601. It was often republished—at Edinburgh, 1615 (with sundry variations, see Bonar, p. 172), again in London, 1633, 1645, 1728, 1851, and quite recently, (from the Oxford edition of 1601, with the variations of the edition of 1728) by Dr. Gerhart and Dr. Louis Steiner in the "Mercersburg Review" for 1862, pp. 74 sqq. The one now in use in the Dutch and German Reformed Churches in America, is traced (by the late Dr. De Witt of New York) to Dr. LAIDLIE, originally from Scotland, minister at Flushing, Long Island, and was adopted, 1771, by the Synod of the Reformed Dutch Church. These three English translations seem to be only different recensions of one translation from the Latin text.

† See the tercentenary triglot edition of 1863, noticed in the literature above.

mich aus aller Gewalt des Teufels erlöset hat; und also bewahret, daß ohne den Willen meines Vaters im Himmel kein Haar von meinem Haupte kann fallen, ja auch mir alles zu meiner Seligkeit dienen muß. Darum er mich auch durch seinen heiligen Geist des ewigen Lebens versichert, und ihm fort hin zu leben von Herzen willig und bereit macht.

Frage 2. Wie viele Stücke sind dir nöthig zu wissen, daß du in diesem Troste seliglich leben und sterben mögest?

Drei Stücke: Erstlich, wie groß meine Sünde und Elend sei. Zum Andern, wie ich von allen meinen Sünden und Elend erlöset werde. Und zum Dritten, wie ich Gott für solche Erlösung soll dankbar sein.

plenissime satisfaciens, * me ab omni potestate diaboli liberavit, meque ita conservat, ut sine voluntate Patris mei celestis, ne pilus quidem de meo capite possit cadere: imò verò etiam omnia salutis meae servare oporteat. Quo-circa me quoque suo Spiritu de vita æterna certum facit utque ipsi deinceps vivam promptum ac paratum reddit.

Qu. 2. Quot sunt tibi scitu necessaria, ut ista † consolatione fruens, beatè vivas et moriaris?

Tria. Primum quanta sit peccati mei et miseriæ meae magnitudo. Secundum, ‡ quo pacto ab omni peccato et miseria liberer. Tertium, quam gratiam Deo pro ea liberatione debeam.

SCOTCH EDITION OF 1591.

From Dunlop's Collection (1722).

Ques. 1. What is thy only comfort in life and in death?

That in soul and body, whether I live or die, I am not mine own, but I belong unto my most faithful Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ: who by His precious blood most fully satisfying for all my sins, hath delivered me from the whole power of the Devil; and doth so preserve me, that without the will of my heavenly Father, not so much as a hair can fall from my head: yea, all things are made to serve for my salvation. Wherefore by his Spirit also, He assureth me of everlasting life, and maketh me ready and prepared, that henceforth I may live unto him.

BISHOP PARREY'S TRANSLATION (1591).

Oxford Edition of 1601.

Ques. 1. What is thy only comfort in life and death?

That both in soul and body, whether I live or die, I am not mine own, but belong wholly ‡ unto my most faithful Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who by His precious blood most fully satisfying for all my sins, hath delivered me from all the power of the devil, and so preserveth me, that without the will of my heavenly Father not so much as a hair may fall from my head, yea, all things must serve for my safety. Wherefore by His Spirit also He assureth me of everlasting life, and maketh me ready, and prepared, that henceforth I may live to Him.

* So also the Oxford *Sylloge*. The ed. *Græco Latina* of Sylburg reads instead: *plenissima solutione facta*.

† Al. edd. *illa*.

‡ Al. *Aliorum*.

‡ The redundant "wholly" occurs also in the Edinburgh edition of 1615, which, to judge from the specimens given by Horatius Bonar (in *Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, p. 172), is a reprint of Parrey's translation with a few variations.

Ques. 2. How many things are needful for thee to know, to the end [that] thou, enjoying this Comfort, mayest live and die an happy man?

Three things. First, What is the greatness of my sin, and of my misery. Secondly, By what means I may be delivered from all my sin and misery. Thirdly, What thankfulness I owe to God for that deliverance.

THE RECEIVED AMERICAN VERSION, 1771.

Ques. 1. What is thy only comfort in life and death?

That I with body and soul, both in life and death, am not my own, but belong unto my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who, with His precious blood, hath fully satisfied for all my sins, and delivered me from all the power of the devil; and so preserves me that without the will of my heavenly Father, not a hair can fall from my head; yea, that all things must be subservient to my salvation; and therefore, by his Holy Spirit, he also assures me of eternal life, and makes me sincerely willing and ready henceforth, to live unto Him.

Ques. 2. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou, enjoying this comfort, mayest live and die happily?

Three; the first, how great my sins and miseries are; the second, how I may be delivered from all my sins and miseries; the third, how I shall express my gratitude to God for such deliverance.

NOTE.—All the English versions, except the last, follow the Latin in its departures from the German, as “most faithful Lord” (*fidelissimi Domini*) for “faithful” (*getreuen*) “heavenly Father” (*Patris celestis*) for “Father in heaven” (*Vater im Himmel*). The dependence on the Latin may be seen also in the words, “most fully satisfying” (*plenissime satisfaciens*), “delivered” (*liberavit*) for “redeemed” (*erlöst*), “delivery” (*liberatio*) for “redemption” (*Erlösung*), and in the omission of “heartily” (*von Herzen*), for which, however, the common American version (which seems to have made use also of the Dutch version) substitutes “sincerely.”

CHARACTER AND AIM.

The Heidelberg Catechism answers the double purpose of a guide for the religious instruction of the youth and a confession of faith for the Church.

Ques. 2. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou enjoying this comfort mayest live and die happily?

Three. The first, what is the greatness of my sin and misery. The second, how I am delivered from all sin and misery. The third, what thanks I owe unto God for this delivery.

THE NEW AMERICAN VERSION, 1863.

Ques. 1. What is thy only comfort in life and in death?

That I, with body and soul, both in life and in death, am not my own, but belong to my faithful Saviour Jesus Christ, who with His precious blood has fully satisfied for all my sins, and redeemed from all the power of the devil; and so preserves me, that without the will of my Father in heaven not a hair can fall from my head; yea, that all things must work together for my salvation. Wherefore, by His Holy Spirit, He also assures me of eternal life, and makes me heartily willing and ready henceforth to live unto Him.

Ques. 2. How many things are necessary for thee to know, that thou in this comfort mayest live and die happily?

Three things: First, the greatness of my sin and misery. Second, how I am redeemed from all my sin and misery. Third, how I am to be thankful to God for such redemption.

As a catechism it is an acknowledged masterpiece, with few to equal and none to surpass it. Its only defect is that its answers are mostly too long for the capacity and memory of children. It is intended for a riper age. Hence an abridgement was made as early as 1585, but no attempts to simplify and popularize it have been able to supersede it.

As a standard of public doctrine the Heidelberg Catechism is the most catholic and popular of all the Reformed symbols. The German Reformed Church acknowledges no other. The Calvinistic system is herein set forth with wise moderation, and without its sharp, angular points. This may be a defect in logic, but it is an advantage in religion, which is broader and deeper than logic. Children and the mass of the people are unable to appreciate metaphysical distinctions and the transcendent' mysteries of eternal decrees. The doctrine of election to holiness and salvation in Christ (or the positive and edifying part of the dogma of predestination) is indeed incidentally set forth as a source of humility, gratitude, and comfort (Ques. 1, 31, 53, 54), but nothing is said of a *double* predestination, or of an eternal decree of *reprobation*, or of a *limited* atonement (comp. Ques 37). These difficult questions are left to private opinion and theological science. This reserve is the more remarkable since the authors (as well as all other Reformers, except Melanchthon in his later period) were strict predestinarians.

PLAN AND ARRANGEMENT.

The Heidelberg Catechism follows the order of the Epistle to the Romans, and is divided into three parts. The first two questions are introductory. The first part treats of the sin and misery of man (Ques. 3-11; comp. Rom. 1. 18-iii. 20); the second of the redemption by Christ (Ques. 12-85; comp. Rom. iii. 21-xi. 36); the third of the thankfulness of the redeemed, or the Christian life (Ques. 86-129; comp. Rom. xii. xvi.) The second part is the largest, and contains an explanation of

all the articles of the Apostles' Creed under the three heads of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. The doctrine of the sacraments is rightly incorporated in this part, instead of being treated in separate sections, as in the Roman and Lutheran Catechisms. The third part gives an exposition of the Decalogue (as a rule of obedience, viewed in the light of redemption) and of the Lord's Prayer.

This order corresponds to the development of religious life and to the three leading ideas of repentance, faith, and love. The conception of Christian life, as an expression of gratitude for redeeming grace, is truly evangelical. In older catechisms the five or six parts of a catechism—namely, the Creed, the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, the Lord's Supper—are mechanically co-ordinated; here they are worked up into an organic system.

The execution is admirable throughout. Several answers are acknowledged gems in the history of catechetical literature—*e. g.*, the definition of faith (Ques. 21), on providence (Ques. 27 and 28), on the significance of the Christian name (Ques. 31 and 32), on the benefit of the ascension (Ques. 49), and on justification by faith (Ques. 60).

THE SPIRIT OF THE CATECHISM.

The genius of the Catechism is brought out at once in the first question, which contains the central idea, and strikes the key-note. It is unsurpassed for depth, comfort, and beauty, and, once committed to memory, can never be forgotten. It represents Christianity in its evangelical, practical, cheering aspect, not as a commanding law, not as an intellectual scheme, not as a system of outward observances, but as the best gift of God to man, as a source of peace and comfort in life and in death. What can be more comforting, what at the same time more honoring and stimulating to a holy life than the assurance of being owned wholly by Christ our blessed Lord and Saviour, who sacrificed His own spotless life for us on the cross? The

first question and answer of the Heidelberg Catechism is the whole gospel in a nutshell; blessed is he who can repeat it from the heart and hold it fast to the end.*

It would be difficult to find a more evangelical definition of faith than in Ques. 21: "Faith is not only a certain knowledge whereby I hold for truth all that God has revealed to us in His Word; but also a hearty trust, which the Holy Spirit works in me by the gospel, that not only to others, but to me also, forgiveness of sins, everlasting righteousness, and salvation are freely given by God, merely of grace, only for the sake of Christ's merits." How rich and consoling is the lesson derived from God's all-ruling Providence in Ques. 28! "That we may be patient in adversity, thankful in prosperity, and for what is future have good confidence in our faithful God and Father, that no creature shall separate us from His love, since all creatures are so in His hand that without His will they can not so much as move."

The Catechism is a work of religious enthusiasm, based on solid theological learning, and directed by excellent judgment. It is baptized with the pentecostal fire of the great Reformation, yet remarkably free from the polemic zeal and intolerance which characterized that wonderfully excited period—by far the richest and deepest in Church history next to the age of Christ and His inspired apostles. It is the product of the

* Dr. Nevin (*Tercentenary Edition*, Introd. p. 85) says: "No question in the whole Catechism has been more admired than this, and none surely is more worthy of admiration. Where shall we find, in the same compass, a more beautifully graphic, or a more impressively full and pregnant representation of all that is comprehended for us in the grace of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? For thousands and tens of thousands, during the past three hundred years, it has been as a whole system of theology in the best sense of the term; their pole-star over the sea of life, and the sheet-anchor of their hope amid the waves of death. But what we quote it for now is simply to show the mind that actuates and rules the Catechism throughout. We have here at once its fundamental conception and the reigning law of its construction; the key-note, we may say, which governs its universal sense, and whose grandly solemn tones continue to make themselves heard through all its utterances from beginning to end."

heart as well as the head, full of faith and unction from above. It is fresh, lively, glowing, yet clear, sober, self-sustained. The ideas are Biblical and orthodox, and well fortified by Scripture proofs.* The language is dignified, terse, nervous, popular, and often truly eloquent. It is the language of devotion as well as instruction. Altogether the Heidelberg Catechism is more than a book, it is an institution, and will live as long as the Reformed Church.

COMPARISON WITH THE LUTHERAN AND WESTMINSTER CATECHISMS.

The Heidelberg Catechism stands mediating between Luther's Small Catechism, which appeared thirty-four years earlier (1529), and the Shorter Westminster Catechism, which was prepared eighty-four years later (1647).

These are the three most popular and useful catechisms that Protestantism has produced, and have still the strongest hold upon the churches they represent. They have the twofold character of catechisms and symbolical books. They are alike evangelical in spirit and aim; they lead directly to Christ as the one and all-sufficient Saviour, and to the Word of God as the only infallible rule of the Christian's faith and life.

Luther's Catechism is the most churchly of the three, and adheres to the Catholic tradition in its order and arrangement. It assigns a very prominent place to the Sacraments, treating them in separate chapters, co-ordinate with the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer; while the others incorporate them in the general exposition of the articles of faith. Luther teaches baptismal regeneration and the corporeal presence, and even retains private confession and absolution as a quasi-sacra-

* Ques. 44 is hardly an exception; for the idea therein expressed is no error *per se*, but only a false interpretation of the article on Christ's descent into hell (Hades) in the Apostles' Creed, which places it, as an actual fact, between death and the resurrection, in accordance with the Scriptures (Luke xxiii. 43; Acts ii. 27, 31; 1 Pet. iii. 19; iv. 6; Eph. iv. 9, 10); while the Catechism, following Calvin and Lasky, understands it figuratively of Christ's suffering on the cross.

ment. Heidelberg and Westminster are free from all remnants of sacerdotalism and sacramentalism, and teach the Calvinistic theory of the sacraments, which rises, however, much higher than the Zwinglian.

On the other hand, the Lutheran and the Heidelberg Catechisms differ from the Westminster in the following points: 1. They retain the Apostles' Creed as the basis of doctrinal exposition; while the Westminster Catechism puts it in an appendix, and substitutes a new logical scheme of doctrine for the old historical order of the Creed. 2. They are subjective, and address the catechumen as a church member, who answers from his real or prospective personal experience; while the Westminster Catechism is objective and impersonal, and states the answer in an abstract proposition. 3. They use the warm and direct language of life, the Westminster, the scholastic language of dogma; hence the former two are less definite but more expansive and suggestive than the Presbyterian formulary, which, on the other hand, far surpasses them in brevity, terseness and accuracy of definition.

Upon the whole we prefer the catechetical style and method of the creative Reformation period, because it is more Biblical and fresh, to that of the seventeenth century—the age of scholastic orthodoxy—although we freely concede the relative progress and peculiar excellences of the Westminster standards.*

* "It may be questioned," says Dr. Bonar, of the Free Church of Scotland, "whether the Church gained any thing by the exchange of the Reformation standards for those of the seventeenth century. The scholastic mould in which the latter are cast has somewhat trenchoned upon the ease and breadth which mark the former; and the skillful metaphysics employed at Westminster in giving lawyer-like precision to each statement have imparted a local and temporary aspect to the new which did not belong to the more ancient standards. Or, enlarging the remark, we may say that there is something about the theology of the Reformation which renders it less likely to be the covenant. The simpler formulas of the older age are quite as explicit as those of the latter; while by the adoption of the Biblical in preference to the scholastic mode of expression they have secured for themselves a buoyancy which will bear them up when the others go down. The old age of that generation is likely to be greener than that of their posterity." (*Catechisms of the Scottish Reformation*, Preface, p. viii).

The Heidelberg Catechism differs from that of Luther—1. By its fullness and thoroughness, and hence it is better adapted to a maturer age; while that of Luther has the advantage of brevity and childlike simplicity, and adaptation to early youth. The one has one hundred and twenty-nine, the other only forty questions and answers, and of these only three are devoted to the exposition of the Apostles' Creed, while the Sacraments receive disproportionate attention. 2. The Heidelberg Catechism gives the words of the Decalogue in full, according to the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and follows the old Jewish and Greek division, which is adopted by the best commentators; while Luther presents merely an abridgement,* and follows the Roman division by omitting the second commandment and splitting the tenth in two.† 3. The former gives a summary of the law, through which comes the knowledge of sin, in the first part (Ques. 3 and 4), but explains the Decalogue in the third division, viewing it in its Christian aspect as a permanent rule of life; while Luther regards the law in its Jewish or pedagogic aspect, as a school-master leading men to Christ, and hence he put it as the first head before the Creed. Ursinus correctly says: "The Decalogue belongs to the first part so far as it is a mirror of our sin and misery, but also to the third part as being the rule of our new obedience and Christian life."‡ 4. In the rendering of the Creed, besides minor verbal differences, the Heidelberg Catechism retains "the holy catholic Church," with the addition of "Christian" (*eine heilige Allgemeine Christliche Kirche*); while Luther's omits "catholic," and substitutes for it "Christian."§ 5. In the Lord's Prayer the Heidelberg Cate-

* For example, the fourth (third) commandment is thus condensed: "*Du sollst den Feiertag heiligen*" (Thou shalt keep holy the rest-day).

† Comp. p. 251, note 2.

‡ The Germans express the different aspects of the law by calling it a *Sünden-spiegel Sündenriegel*, and *Lebensregel*, a mirror of sin, a bar of sin, and a rule of life.

§ Hence in Germany the term "Catholic" and "Romanist" are used synonymously, and the proverb "*Das ist um katholisch zu werden*" expresses a desperate condition of things. The English Churches have properly retained the term "catholic" in its good old sense, instead of allowing Romanists to monopolize it.

chism uses the modern form "Our Father" (*Unser Vater*), while Luther in his Catechism (though not in his translation of Matt. vi. 9 and Luke xi. 2) adheres to the Latin and old German form of "Father our" (*Vater unser*), a difference tenaciously maintained by German Lutherans. The former divides the Prayer into six petitions (with the Greek commentators), and renders ἐκ πονηροῦ "from the evil one" (*vom Bösen*, i. e., from the devil); while Luther (with Augustine) numbers seven petitions, and translates (herein agreeing with the English version) "from evil" (*vom Uebel*).

The difference between the Heidelberg and Westminster Catechisms is chiefly one of nationality. Where the choice is between the two, the former will be used in preference by Germans, the other by Scotch and English Presbyterians. The Westminster Shorter Catechism has the advantage of greater condensation and precision. It is not impossible to make a better one than either by blending the excellencies of both. They represent also two types of piety: the one is more emotional and hearty, the other more scholastic and intellectual. This appears at once in the first question. The Heidelberg Catechism asks: "What is thy only *comfort* in life and in death?" The Westminster: "What is the chief *end* of man?" The one goes clearly into the heart of evangelical piety—the mystical union of the believer with Christ; the other goes back to the creation and the glory of God; but both teach the same God and Christ, and the same way of salvation, whereby God is glorified, and man is raised to everlasting felicity in his enjoyment.

HISTORY OF THE CATECHISM.

1. The Heidelberg Catechism was greeted with great joy, and was at once introduced into the churches and schools of the Lower Palatinate; while the Upper Palatinate, under the governorship of Louis (the eldest son of Frederick III.), remained strictly Lutheran.

But, like every good book, it had to pass through a trial of

probation and a fire of martyrdom. Even before it was printed an anonymous writer attacked the Heidelberg Synod which, in December, 1562, had adopted the Catechism in manuscript, together with sundry measures of reform.* After its publication it was violently assailed by strict Lutherans for its alleged Zwinglian and Calvinistic heresies, and by Jesuits on account of the condemnation of the idolatry of the mass in the eightieth question. The first opponents were Lutheran princes (Margrave Charles II. of Baden, Duke Christopher of Württemberg, the Palatine of Zweibrücken), and Lutheran divines, such as Heshusius, Flacius, Brentius, and Andreae.† Ursinus wrote an able apology of his Catechism, which is embodied in several older editions since 1584. A theological colloquy was held at Maulbronn in April, 1564, where the theological leaders of the Lutheran Duchy of Württemberg and the Reformed Palatinate, in the presence of their princes, debated for six days in vain on the eucharist and the ubiquity of Christ's body. Both parties were confirmed in their opinions, though the Reformed had the best of the argument.‡

Frederick III., notwithstanding his appeal to Melancthon and the Altered Augsburg Confession, was openly charged with apostasy from the Lutheran faith, and seriously threatened with exclusion from the peace of the empire. Even the liberal Emperor Maximilian II. wrote him a letter of remonstrance. His fate was to be decided at the Diet of Augsburg, 1566. At this

* This curious document, which throws light upon that Synod hitherto little known, has been recently recovered and published by Wolters in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1867, No. 1, pp. 15 sqq. The Lutheran author, perhaps a dissenting member of the Synod, gives a list of the measures for the introduction of the Catechism and the abolition of various abuses, and accompanies them with bitter marginal comments, such as: "This is a lie and against God's Word;" "This is the Anabaptist heresy;" "To spread Zwinglianism;" "*Friss Vogel oder stirb*;" "*Ad spargendam sisaniam*;" "*Ut citius imbibant venenum*;" "*Evangelii abrogatio*;" "*Hispanica inquisitione*."

† See on this Lutheran opposition Wolters, l. c., and in his earlier book, *Der Heidelb. Katechismus in seiner Urgestalt* (1864), pp. 141—196; Nevin, *Introd. to the Tercent.* Ed. pp. 42 sqq.; and especially Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, pp. 140 sqq.

‡ See above, pp. 288 sqq.

critical juncture the pious Elector boldly defended his Catechism, which, he said, was all taken from the Bible, and so well fortified with marginal proof-texts that it could not be overthrown. He declared himself willing to yield to God's truth, if any one could show him anything better from the Scriptures, which was at hand for the purpose. Altogether he made, at the risk of his crown and his life, such a noble and heroic confession as reminds us of Luther's stand at the Diet of Worms. Even his Lutheran opponents were filled with admiration and praise, and left him thereafter in quiet possession of his faith. "Why do ye persecute this man?" said the Margrave of Baden; "he has more piety than the whole of us." The Elector Augustus of Saxony gave similar testimony on this memorable occasion.*

Thus the Catechism had gained a sort of legal existence in the German empire, although it was not till after the Thirty-Years' War, in the Treaty of Westphalia, that the Reformed Church, as distinct from the Lutheran, was formally recognized in Germany.

After the death of Frederick it had to pass through another persecution in the home of its birth. His successor, Louis VI. (1576-1583), exiled its authors, and replaced it by Luther's Catechism and the Formula of Concord. But under the regency of Frederick's second son, Prince John Casimir, the Heidelberg Catechism and the Reformed Church were restored to their former honor, and continued to flourish till the outbreak of the Thirty-Years' War.

This war brought terrible devastation and untold misery upon Heidelberg and the Palatinate, which were laid waste by the merciless Tilly (1622). Then followed the repeated invasions

* Hundeshagen says of Frederick III.: "He is acknowledged to be the greatest ruler which the evangelical Palatinate ever had, and as to personal piety and loyalty to his faith the shining model of an evangelical prince." See his art. on the City and University of Heidelberg, in the *Gedenkbuch der 300 jährigen Jubelfeier des Heidelb. Kat.* pp. 58, 59.

of Turenne, Melac, and Marshal de Lorges, under Louis XIV. The Palatinate fell even into the hands of Roman Catholic rulers (1685), and never again rose to its former glory. Thousands of Protestants emigrated to America, and planted the Catechism in Pennsylvania, so that what it lost in the old world it gained in the new. The indifferentism and rationalism of the eighteenth century allowed all creeds to go into disuse and neglect. In the nineteenth century faith revived, and with it respect for the Heidelberg Catechism; but owing to the introduction of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in the Grand Duchy of Baden, to which Heidelberg now belongs, it was merged into a new catechism compiled from it and from that of Luther.*

The history of the Palatinate Catechism extends far beyond the land of its birth. It took deeper root and acquired greater influence in other countries. Soon after its appearance it commended itself by its intrinsic excellences to all Reformed Churches of the German tongue. It was introduced in East Friesland, Juelich (Juliers), Cleve (Cleves), Berg, the Wupperthal, Bremen, Hesse Casel, Anhalt, Brandenburg, East and West Prussia, the free imperial cities, in Hungary, Poland, and in several cantons of Switzerland, as St. Gall, Schaffhausen and Berne.† In the royal house of Prussia it is still used in the instruction of the princes, even after the introduction of the union of the two confessions.‡

* On the symbolical status of the Evangelical Church in Baden, see two essays of Dr. Hundeshagen, *Die Bekenntnisgrundlage der vereinigten evangelischen Kirche im Grossherzogthum Baden* (1851), and an address delivered before a Pastoral Conference at Durlach, on the same subject, 1851, republished in his *Schriften und Abhandlungen*, ed. by Dr. Christlieb, Gotha, 1875, Vol. II. pp. 119 sqq.

† The editions used in the Canton Berne have an anti-supralapsarian addition to Question 27: "*Und obwohl die Sünden durch Gottes Fuhrschung, werden regiert, so ist doch Got keine Ursache der Sünden; denn das Ziel unterscheidet die Werke. Siehe Exempel an Joseph und seinen Brudern, an David und Simeon an Christo und den Juden.*" This addition is found as early as 1697. Noticed by Trechsel in *Studien und Kritiken* for 1867, p. 574.

‡ So I was informed by the late court chaplain, Dr. Schnethlage, of Berlin, who was originally Reformed, and who confirmed several members of the royal family

It was surrounded with a large number of learned works: which fill an important place in the history of Reformed theology. Eminent professors made it the basis of lectures in the University.

In no country was the Catechism more honored than in Holland and her distant colonies in Asia and Africa. It soon replaced the catechisms of Calvin and Lasky. The synods of Wesel, 1568, of Emden, 1571, and of Dort, 1574, recommended and enjoined its use; and ministers were required to explain it to the people in fifty two lessons throughout the year in the afternoon service of the Lord's day. In the beginning of the sixteenth century the Arminians called for a revision of it, to remove certain features to which they objected. But the famous General Synod of Dort, after a careful examination, opposed any change, and, in its 148th Session, May 1, 1619, it unanimously delivered the judgment that the Heidelberg Catechism "formed altogether a most accurate compend of the orthodox Christian faith; being with singular skill, not only adapted to the understanding of the young, but suited also for the advantageous instruction of older persons; so that it could continue to be taught with great edification in the Belgic churches, and ought by all means to be retained." This judgment was agreed to by all the foreign delegates from Germany, Switzerland, and England, and has thus an œcumenical significance for the Reformed communion.

The Heidelberg Catechism was also clothed with symbolical authority in Scotland, and was repeatedly printed "by public authority," even after the Westminster standards had come into use. It seems to have there practically superseded Calvin's Catechism, but it was in turn superseded by Craig's Catechism, and Craig's by that of the Westminster Assembly.

3. From Holland the Heidelberg Catechism crossed the Atlantic to Manhattan Island (1609), with the discoverer of the Hudson River, and was the first Protestant catechism planted on American soil. A hundred years later, German

emigrants, driven from the Palatinate by Romish persecution and tyranny, carried it to Pennsylvania and other colonies.* It has remained ever since the honored symbol of the Dutch and German Reformed Churches in America, and will continue to be used as long as they retain their separate denominational existence, or even if they should unite with the larger Presbyterian body.

One of the first acts of the reunited Presbyterian Church in the United States, at the session of the General Assembly in Philadelphia, May, 1870, was the formal sanction of the use of the Heidelberg Catechism in any congregation which may desire it.†

4. In the year 1863, three centuries after its first publication, the Heidelberg Catechism witnessed its greatest triumph, not only in Germany and Holland, but still more in a land which the authors never saw, and in a language the sound of which they probably never heard. The Reformation was similarly honored in 1817, and the Augsburg Confession in 1830, but no other catechism so far as I know.

In Germany the tercentenary celebration of the Heidelberg

* The early German settlers of Pennsylvania came mostly from the Palatinate. See the interesting volume of Professor Daniel Rupp: *A Collection of over Thirty thousand Names of Immigrants in Pennsylvania from 1727—1776*. Philad. 1876

† A special committee, appointed by the Old School Assembly of 1869, reported to the first reunited Assembly of 1870, after a laudatory description of the Heidelberg Catechism, the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:

1. *Resolved*, That this General Assembly recognizes in the Heidelberg Catechism a valuable Scriptural compendium of Christian doctrine and duty.

2. *Resolved*, That if any churches desire to employ the Heidelberg Catechism in the instruction of their children, they may do so with the approbation of this Assembly.

See the *Minutes of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America for 1870*, p. 120, and the Memorial volume on *Presbytery*.

Catechism was left to individual pastors and congregations, and called forth some valuable publications.*

The German Reformed Church in the United States took it up as a body, and gave it a wider scope. She made the three-hundredth anniversary of her confession the occasion for a general revival of theological and religious life, the publication of a triglot edition of the Catechism, the endowment of a tercentenary professorship in her seminary, and the collection of large sums of money for churches, missions, and other benevolent objects. All these objects were accomplished. The celebration culminated in a general convention of ministers and laymen in Philadelphia, which lasted a whole week, January 17-23, 1863, in the midst of the raging storm of the civil war. About twenty interesting and instructive essays on the Catechism and connected topics, which had been specially prepared for the occasion by eminent German, Dutch, and American divines, were read in two churches before crowded and attentive assemblies. Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanckthon, Frederick III., Ursinus, and Olevianus were called from their graves to reproduce before an American audience the ideas, trials, and triumphs of the creative and heroic age of the Reformation. Altogether the year 1863 marks an epoch in the history of the Heidelberg Catechism and of the German Reformed Church in America.†

* Among these we mention the articles on the Heidelberg Catechism by Ullmann, Saek, Plitt, Hundeshagen, Wolters, and Trechsel, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, 1864, and 1867, the discovery and reprint of the *ed. princeps* by Wolters (1864), and a collection of excellent sermons by distinguished Reformed pulpit orators, under the title, "*Der einiget Trost im Leben und Sterben*," Elberfeld, 1863.

† See the *Tercentenary Monument* (574 pages), and the *Gedenkbuch der dreihundertjährigen Jubeleier des Heidelberger Katechismus* (449 pages), both published at Philadelphia, 1863. The German edition gives the correspondence and essays of Drs. Herzog, Ebrard, Ullmann, Hundeshagen, Lange, and Schotel, in the original German, together with a history of the Catechism by the editor. The Anglo-American essays and addresses of Drs. Nevin, Schaaff, Gerhart, Harbaugh, Wolff, Bomberger, Porter, De Witt, Kieffer, Theodor and Thomas Appel, Schneck, Russell, Gans, and Bausman, are found in full in the English edition.

OPINIONS ON THE CATECHISM.

We close this chapter with a selection from the many warm commendations which the Heidelberg Catechism has received from distinguished divines of different countries.

HENRY BULLINGER, the friend and successor of Zwingli, himself the author of a catechism (1559) and of the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), wrote to a friend :

"The order of the book is clear ; the matter true, good, and beautiful ; the whole is luminous, fruitful and godly ; it comprehends many and great truths in a small compass. I believe that no better catechism has ever been issued."*

The HESSIAN divines quoted by David Pareus :

"There is no catechism more thorough, more perfect, and better adapted to the capacity of adults as well as the young."

The English delegates to the Synod of Dort, George Carleton, (Bishop of Llandaff), John Davenant (afterwards Bishop of Salisbury), Archdeacon Samuel Ward, Dr. Thomas Goade, and Walter Balcanqual, said :

"That neither their own nor the French Church had a catechism so suitable and excellent ; that those who had compiled it were therein remarkably endowed and assisted by the Spirit of God ; that in several of their works they had excelled other theologians, but that in the composition of this Catechism they had outdone themselves."†

The favorable judgment of the Synod of Dort itself has already been quoted.

Dr. ULLMANN (d. 1865), formerly Professor at Heidelberg, and one of the best Church historians of the nineteenth century.‡

"The Heidelberg Catechism, more systematically executed than Luther's, unfolds upon the fundamental thoughts of sin, redemption, and thankfulness, the Reformed doctrine, yet without touching upon predestination, with rare pithiness and clearness, and obtained through these excellences not only speedy and most extended recognition in the Reformed Churches, but is to-day still regarded by all parties as one of the most masterly productions in this department."

* "*Arbitror meliorem Catechismus non editum esse, Deo sit gloria qui largiatur successum*" (1563). See Ursinus, *Apol. Catech.* in the *Profatio*.

† This judgment is quoted on the title-page of the later editions of Bishop Parry's translation, London ed. 1728 ; reprinted, London, 1851.

‡ In Piper's *Evang.-Kalender* for 1862, p. 191. Comp. also his art. in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, and in the *Gedenkbuch*, etc.

DR. AUG. EBRARD, one of the ablest and most prolific German Reformed divines :*

"For wonderful union of dogmatic precision and genial heartiness,† of lucid perspicuity and mysterious depth, the Heidelberg Catechism stands alone in its kind. It is at once a system of theology and a book of devotion; every child can understand it at the first reading, and yet the catechist finds in it the richest material for profound investigation."

MAX GÖBEL, the author of an excellent history of Christian life in the Reformed Church:‡

"The Heidelberg Catechism may be properly regarded as the flower and fruit of the entire German and French Reformation; it has Lutheran fervor, Melancthonian clearness, Zwinglian simplicity, and Calvinistic fire blended in one, and therefore—notwithstanding many defects and angles—it has been (together with the Altered Augsburg Confession of 1540), and remains to this day, the only common confession and doctrinal standard of the entire German Church from the Palatinate to the Netherlands, and to Brandenburg and Prussia."

KARL SUDHOFF, formerly a Roman Catholic priest, then pastor of the German Reformed Church at Frankfort-on-the-Main:§

"A peculiar power and unction pervades the whole work, which can not easily be mistaken by any one. The book, therefore, speaks with peculiar freshness and animation directly to the soul, because it appears as a confident, joyous confession of the Christian heart assured of salvation. It is addressed to the heart and will as much as to the head. Keen and popular unfolding of ideas is here most beautifully united with the deep feeling of piety, as well as with the earnest spirit of revival and joyous believing confidence. And who that have read this Catechism but once can mistake how indissolubly united with these great excellences is the powerful, dignified, and yet so simple style! What a true-hearted, intelligible, simple, and yet lofty eloquence speaks to us even from the smallest questions!"

DR. K. B. HUNDESHAGEN, Professor of Theology at Heidelberg, afterwards in Bonn (d. 1873), calls the Heidelberg Catechism a "witness of Reformed loyalty to the Word of

* *Das Dogma v. heil. Abendmahl*, Vol. II., p. 604.

† Or, fulness of soul (*gemüthlich Innigkeit*).

‡ *Geschichte des Christl. Lebens*, Vol. I. p. 392.

§ *Theol. Handbuch zur Auslegung des Heid. Kat.* p. 493.

God, of Reformed purity and firmness of faith, of Reformed moderation and sobriety," and a work "of eternal youth and never-ceasing value."*

Dr. PLITT, formerly Pastor in Heidelberg, then Professor of Theology in Bonn:†

"The Heidelberg Catechism still lives; it has not died in three hundred years. It lives in the hearts of Christians. How many catechisms have since then disappeared, how many in the last thirty or forty years, and have been so long sunk in the 'sea of oblivion,' that one scarcely knows their titles. The Heidelberg Catechism has survived its tercentenary jubilee, and will, God willing, see several such jubilees. It will not die; it will live as long as there is an Evangelical Church."

Dr. HENRY HARBAUGH, late Professor of Theology at Mercersburg (d. 1867), a gifted poet and the author of several popular religious works:‡

"It is worthy of profound consideration, that the Heidelberg Catechism, which has always ruled the heart, spirit and body of the Reformed side of the Reformation, has no prototype in any of the Reformers. Zwingli and Calvin can say, It is not of me; it has the suavity but not the compromising spirit of Melancthon. It has nothing of the dashing terror of Luther. What is stranger than all, it is farthest possible removed from the mechanical scholasticism and rigid logic of Ursinus, its principal author. Though it has the warm, practical, sacred, poetical fervor of Olevianus, it has none of his fire and flame. It is greater than Reformers: it is purer and sounder than theologians."

Dr. J. W. NEVIN, successively Professor of Theology in the Presbyterian Seminary at Alleghany, in the German Reformed Seminary at Mercersburg, and President of Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa.:§

"In every view, we may say, the Catechism of the Palatinate, now three hundred years old, is a book entitled, in no common degree, to admiration and praise. It comes before us as the ripe product of the proper confessional life of the Re-

* See his instructive review of Sudhoff's *Handbuch*, in the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1864, pp. 153—180. It is gratifying to me that this distinguished divine fully indorses, on p. 169, the view which I had previously given to the theology of the Heidelberg Catechism and its relation to Calvinism in opposition to Sudhoff on the one hand and Heppe on the other.

† In the *Studien und Kritiken* for 1863, p. 25.

‡ In the *Mercersburg Review* for 1857, p. 102.

§ *Tercentenary Edition*, Introd. pp. 120—122.

formed Church, in the full bloom of its historical developement, as this was reached at the time when the work made its appearance. Its wide-spread and long-continued popularity proclaims its universal significance and worth. It must have been admirably adapted to the wants of the Church at large, as well as admirably true to the inmost-sense of its general life, to come in this way into such vast credit. Among all Protestant symbols, whether of earlier or later date, there is no other in which we find the like union of excellent qualities combined and wrought together in the same happy manner. It is at once a creed, a catechism, and a confession; and all this in such a manner, at the same time, as to be often a very liturgy also, instinct with the full spirit of worship and devotion. It is both simple and profound; a fit manual of instruction for the young, and yet a whole system of divinity for the old; a text-book, suited alike for the use of the pulpit and the family, the theological seminary, and the common school. It is pervaded by a scientific spirit, beyond what is common in formularies of this sort; but its science is always earnestly and solemnly practical. In its whole constitution, as we have seen, it is more a great deal than doctrine merely, or a form of sound words for the understanding. It is doctrine apprehended and represented continually in the form of life. It is for the heart, every where full as much as for the head. Among its characteristic perfections deserves to be noted always, with particular praise, its catholic spirit, and the rich mystical element that pervades so largely its whole composition. . . . Simple beautiful, and clear in its logical construction, the symbol moves throughout also in the element of fresh religious feeling. It is full of sensibility and faith and joyous childlike trust. Its utterances rise at times to a sort of heavenly pathos and breathe forth almost lyrical strains of devotion."

Dr. HAGENBACH, the well-known historian (d. at Basle, 1874): *

"The Heidelberg Catechism was greeted not only in the Palatinate but in all Reformed Churches as the correct expression of the Reformed faith, and attained the authority of a genuine symbolical standard. It was translated into nearly all languages, and has continued to be the basis of religious instruction to this day. . . . Its tone, notwithstanding the scholastic and dogmatizing or (as Ullmann says) constructive tendency, is truly popular and childlike."

Then he quotes several questions as models of the catechetical style.

Dr. DALTON, of St. Petersburg: †

"The Heidelberg Catechism exhibits the harmonious union of the Calvinistic and the Melancthonian spirit. It is the ripe fruit of the whole Reformation and the true heir of the treasures gathered, not in ten years, but during that entire period. It is thoroughly Biblical, and represents its particular denominational type with great wisdom and moderation. We feel from beginning to end in the clear and expressive word the warm and sound pulse of a heart that was baptized by the fire and Spirit from above, and knows what it believes."

* *Kirchengeschichte*, Leipz. 1870 (3d edition), Vol. IV. p. 312.

† *Immanuel. Der Heidelb. Kat.*, etc. 1870, p. 15.

It is gratifying that the Lutheran hostility of former days has given way to a sincere appreciation. Drs. GUERICKE and KURTZ, two prominent champions of Lutheran orthodoxy in the nineteenth century, in almost the same words praise the Heidelberg Catechism for "its signal wisdom in teaching, its Christian fervor, theological ability, and mediating moderation."* Dr. JULIUS STAHL, an eminent jurist and the ablest apologist of modern Lutheranism within the Prussian Union, derived the religious revival of the Lutheran Church in his native Bavaria and his own conversion chiefly from the late venerable Reformed pastor and Professor, Dr. J. Chr. G. L. Krafft, in Erlangen (died 1845). "The man," he said, before the General Synod at Berlin, 1846, "who built up the Church in my fatherland, *the most apostolic man I ever met in my life*. Pastor Krafft, was a strict adherent of the Reformed creed. Whether he carried the Heidelberg Catechism in his pocket I know not, but this I know, that he caused throughout the whole land a spring to bloom whose fruits will ripen for eternity."†

* Guericke *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. III. p. 610 (7th edition), and his *Symbolik*. Kurtz, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, p. 508 (5th edition).

† See art. *Krafft* by Goebel, in Herzog's *Encycl.* Vol. VIII. p. 37.

ART. IV.—EMANUEL SWEDENBORG.

- I. **THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION:** Containing The Universal Theology of The New Testament, Foretold by the Lord in Daniel vii. 13, 14; and in Revelation xxi. 1, 2. By Emanuel Swedenborg, Servant of the Lord Jesus Christ. A New Translation, From The Original Latin Edition. Printed at Amsterdam, in the Year 1771. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1874.
- II. **HEAVEN AND ITS WONDERS AND HELL:** From Things Heard and Seen. By Emanuel Swedenborg. Originally Published In Latin at London, A. D. 1758. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1874.
- III. **Emanuel Swedenborg.** An Essay. By Henry Maudsley. M. D. Fellow of The Royal College of Physicians; Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in University College, London, Etc. Author of "Responsibility in Mental Diseases;" "Physiology and Pathology of the Mind;" "Body and Mind;" "An Inquiry into their Connection and Mutual Influences, Specially in Reference to Mental Disorders." An Enlarged and Revised Edition. To which are Added "Psychological Essays." New York: D. Appleton & Co., 549 and 551 Broadway. 1875.
- IV. **THOUGHTS ON THE WRITINGS OF BARON SWEDENBORG.** Wesley's Works. In Seven Volumes. Vol. VII. Pp. 426-441.
- V. **EMANUEL SWEDENBORG: His Life and Writings.** By William White. In Two Volumes. 1867.

It is far from our purpose to present any special theory on Swedenborg and his "Revelations." We have none; and did we have one, modesty would forbid us, we think, to obtrude it on the public, after every attempt of every corypheus has thus far proven a failure in this direction. And, perhaps, our paper may be none the worse for such a want. What we aim at is, something of a fair statement of the man and his works, however meager, accordingly as we view him and his labors, from this or that position. Swedenborg is a many-sided mortal, and only after a complete portraiture confronts the thinking world, is

there room made to hope that a just and definite conclusion will be reached with regard to the wonderful character. We are not prepared to accept the conclusions which our authorities proffer, on the one hand; nor, on the other, we are bound to say, their refutations, as far as they have come before us. We project our Article, more as a challenge, directed "to whom it may concern," than as a solution of the scholar, philosopher and mystic.

The partial revival of Swedenborg and his writings, of late, is owing, in some measure, to the enthusiasm and generosity of some of the Baron's ardent followers, who have handsomely published and are ready gratuitously to distribute, among the Clergy and candidates for the Holy Ministry, the substance of his "Revelations," as embodied in the two first named volumes, noted above. They bear this Imprimatur:—"This Book is presented by the American New Church Tract and Publication Society, Philadelphia." The Lippincott Firm has added more glory to itself by arraying the most important Theological works of Swedenborg in so attractive a garb. We regard the tasks performed by the generous donors and apt publishers, as a combined stroke of good policy, whereby to scatter the Teachings and multiply the readers of the New Jerusalem Prophet. Two very respectable volumes may be added to many a clerical library, without cost. An acquaintance will, in this way, be made with Swedenborg, on the part of not a few who may have known him merely by name. And others, who never could muster sufficient heroism to toil through his numerous and heavy volumes, or never thought it worth their while to study his writings at all seriously, may now enter by a shorter and easier road in the Arcana of his Creed. Once thus far on, they may become anxious for a still closer relation to the man and his mysteries, and qualify themselves to aid the thinking world to arrive at some more definite conclusion, in reference to the character and claims of Swedenborg. His writings merit an earnest and candid study, and only thereby can any

one venture to pronounce upon him. Swedenborg has lived, and immortalized himself in a mass of literature, and in a train of respectable followers. Such a character cannot be ignored by a course of contemptuous silence pursued against him.

We have grouped certain volumes and essays of his own and of others, with a view of obtaining and conveying, by their help mainly or wholly, some idea of what he was, did, and claimed to do, as well as of what we ought to think of him and his professed mission. We shall not in every instance refer to these authorities, although the material entering into the building of our article is confessed to be not our own. We quote largely from his "Diary," and embody the "Brockmer Narrative," both of which we had never known before. We have in no instance gone beyond our authorities, but held ourselves to the letter, and should be glad even to be convinced that our authorities are fictions. We certainly set down naught in malice. For the amiable enthusiast's sake, we would be glad to be informed that his "Diary," kept by himself between 1743 and 1744, had *not* been discovered in 1858, and that it is *not* now in the Royal Library at Stockholm. We should be glad to hear, too, a conclusive testimony against the "Brockmer Narrative." We have not been able to learn of his lineage and family back of the Grandfather. The patronymic was written SWEDBERG. Emanuel was ennobled in the year 1719, by queen Ulrica Eleonora, and named Swedenborg, from which time he took his seat with the nobles of the equestrian orders in the triennial assembly of the States.

Following him through his life, and over not a few pages of his writings, we felt that we were constantly in fellowship with a human paradox—the maddest sane man, or the sanest mad man that ever left his foot-prints on the world. He is an incarnate puzzle, no matter in what light you view him, or on what theory you would solve him. His writings seem to embody a mass of absurdities and a wealth of philosophic research, at once. He apparently sinks down to a level with the chat-

tering lunatic, and rises to the grandeur of a seer all on one and the same page. It is almost a re-enacting of the ghostly spectacle, recorded of Michael, the Archangel, contending with the devil, over the body of Moses, that one witness in his history—now this one, and then that one possessing the Baron, and manipulating him into a saint and demon, turn and turn about. Like a dragon, let us say, Swedenborg ploughs his own fiery furrow amid and athwart the numberless ancestral and contemporary systems of philosophy and religion, with the utmost complaisancy, and seems to relish nothing better than to whirr his wondrous tail against every theory and every body—the Gospel, David and Paul not excepted. The earnest reader finds himself in a strait betwixt two all along. Try to hold him as a Seer, and you sadly miss all that reverence and modesty that you naturally associate with such a character. Amid prophets, apostles and other acknowledged spiritual worthies, he walks as a stalwart giant over them all. Aside of the eagle-eyed St. John, whom we accept as a Seer of the first order, Swedenborg is an intolerable babbler. Surely, if Emanuel Swedenborg is a prophet, all hands will believe him to have been the last, since no successor would have anything further to relate. He exhausted the Spiritual world, which, indeed, he claims to have done.

But, set him down as a madman, and you are in amazement again. He displays marvelous powers in his rendering of the Holy Scriptures, whenever they fit in and upon his theories, and challenges you besides, to write him down with Emerson, as “one of the mastodons of literature.” He is rich in words of wisdom, fruitful in veins of original thought, and edifying to the best of minds. All that Swedenborg has written is surely not the offspring of madness and folly, if, indeed, any part of it is.

We know well, that the whole task, imposed upon him who would render a verdict upon Swedenborg, is generally reduced down to the plain duty of pronouncing on, and distinguishing

between what is supposed to be chaff or wheat, dross or gold; to sift and prove the mass, and simply to hold fast to that which is good. Normal and abnormal states are assumed to have been predominant at various seasons in turn, and consequently no charge of inconsistency holds, it is claimed, if we accept much that he has written, and reject much too. Even the fallen star is still to be held as a star—it may glitter in the mud indeed. There are lucid intervals, it will be said, during which the madman is capable of a rational intellectual exertion. Genius will flash out and brood brilliantly over the murkiest atmosphere, will it not?

But to entitle one's opinion on Swedenborg to any degree of respect, on such a theory, it is necessary to originate and establish a new theory on *insanity itself*. The common notion concerning the mental abnormality will not afford sufficient standing-room for all the phenomena which crowd into the life and history of this literary and religious Goliath. The mania itself then becomes more mysterious than the man, and the difficulty is thus merely lifted from the one, to be located on the other. Conceding the theory of insanity, as the true one, by which to solve this human riddle, by what theory, then, are we to explain such an order of insanity, which allows the rational and the irrational thus continually to mingle and shade across the several territories of the one and the other? It seems a fair and easy statement to put:—"David and Paul were impostors, or Swedenborg was mad." Who, that accepts the Holy Scriptures, may deny this alternative? But Swedenborg had undoubtedly seasons of mental health, or rational saneness, to such a degree as that we might almost wish to be afflicted in the same way and degree, rather than not prove capable of such mental acuteness. Now to explain this constant interlacing of the philosophic day and anarchical night, at irregular intervals, and on so indefinite a line of demarkation—*this can* hardly be done on the ordinarily accepted theory of sanity or insanity. What shall we call this spirit which can thus at times sport with

the grand original? John Wesley disposed quite poetically, but not very satisfactorily, of Swedenborg by denominating him "majestic, tho' in ruins." Granted. But insanity is not the thing it is supposed to be, if it is competent in this way to disturb the harmony existing between the centripetal and centrifugal forces, which properly determines the orbit of human thought.

Psychology obliges us, we think, to a revision of the whole subject of insanity, if we would dispose of the case of Emanuel Swedenborg, on it as a basis.

But let us lay the axe to the root of the tree, and trace his genealogy. It is something to know whence a man is, since blood will tell.

Swedenborg's Grandfather was a coppersmith and miner, industrious in habit, rich in fortune, and pious in disposition. His large family he counted a favor and blessing; for he was accustomed to say after dinner—"Thank you, my children, for dinner. I have dined with you, and not you with me. God has given me food for your sake."

Jasper Swedenborg, the Father of Emanuel, showed an early love for books, and a fancy for public speaking. He was educated for the ministry, and, by energy and tact, became Bishop of Skara. Charles XI. looked kindly on him. In high station, under royal favor, of good health, ambitious, self-confident, and always busy, he not only discharged his Episcopal duties with more than routine alacrity, but performed a vast deal of extraordinary labor. "I can scarcely believe," says he, "that anybody in Sweden has written so much as I have done; since, I think, ten carts would scarcely carry away what I have written and printed at my own expense, yet there is as much, verily, there is nearly as much not printed."

Not only had he the satisfaction of being appreciated by himself and his cotemporaries, but, what is more, he held himself a favorite of the Lord. "It is incredible and indescribable," he exclaims when made Dean of Upsala, "what consolation and peace are felt by the servants of the Lord when raised

to a high and holy calling; and contrariwise how down-hearted they must be who experience no such elevation."

In his domestic relations he experienced joy and sorrow, in turn. By the death of his first wife, he was left a widower with eight children, the eldest of them not twelve years old; but he soon took to himself a second wife, distinguished for her "piety, meekness, liberality to the poor," and who was moreover "well-off, good-looking, a thrifty housewife, and had no family." She died, and within a year after her death, he married for the third time, being then in his sixty-seventh year. "My circumstances and my extensive household required a faithful companion, whom God gave me in Christina Arhusia." In choosing his wives he seems to have followed a rule which he felt prompted to suggest to his son, and which lies hidden in these words:—"You write well, you reckon well, and, thank God, you are not married. See that you get a good wife, *and something with her*. Pray God to lead you in His holy way."

He believed ardently in the efficacy of Prayer, persuading himself that he could perform miraculous cures thereby. "There was," he says, "brought to me at Strabo a maid-servant named Kerstin, possessed with devils in mind and body. I caused her to kneel down with me and pray, and then I read over her, and she arose well and hearty, and quite delivered." On another occasion he called over the same hysterically affected servant, in a loud voice:—"Wake up, and arise in the name of Jesus Christ!" Another servant had a severe pain in her elbow. For days and nights she went about moaning without rest or sleep, and found no relief. "I rose, touched her arm, and commanded the pain in the name of Jesus Christ to depart, and in a moment the one arm was as well as the other. Glory to God alone!"

When nearly eighty years of age he composed his autobiography, making with his own hand six copies of it, and dedicating them to "my children and posterity as an example how to conduct themselves after my death."

Emanuel Swedenborg was his second son, and born on the 29th of January, 1688. His name was designed, "thereby to be reminded continually of the nearness of God." His mother is thus spoken of by the Bishop:—"Although she was the daughter of an assessor, and the wife of a rector in Upsala, and of a wealthy family, she never dressed extravagantly. As every woman in those days wore a sinful and troublesome *fontange*, or top-knot, she was obliged to do as others did and wear it; but hearing that a cow in the island of Gothland had, with great labor and pitiable bellowing, brought forth a calf with a top-knot, she took her own and her girl's hoods and threw them all into the fire; and she made a vow that she and her daughters, as long as they were under her authority, should never more put such things on their heads."

Emanuel's childhood and early youth are discovered to us in his own spare words, written in old age:—

"From my fourth to my tenth year, my thoughts were constantly engrossed in reflecting on God, on salvation, and on the spiritual affections of man. I often revealed things in my discourse which filled my parents with astonishment, and made them declare at times that certainly the angels spoke through my mouth. From my sixth to my twelfth year, it was my greatest delight to converse with the clergy concerning faith; to whom I observed that 'charity or love is the life of faith.'"

A notable peculiarity which he declares to have distinguished him in his early years, and made him unlike other children, was a power of almost suspending his breathing; when deeply absorbed in prayer, he hardly seemed to breathe at all. On this nervous spasm he, in later days, founded a theory concerning respiration, and his disciples see in it the root-power of entering into the spirit-world.

Of his later youth and early manhood we may speak more fully. He was educated at the University of Upsala, where he took the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the age of twenty-one. He solidified his knowledge through travel, remaining

some time in London, Paris, and Hamburg, ever seeking out men eminent in mathematics, astronomy, and mechanics. On his return he located in the university town of Griefsvalde, diligently prosecuting his studies. He speaks of being engaged, at this period, on fourteen wonderful mechanical inventions. Among these were, a sort of driving-ship, an engine, an air-gun, a balloon, a *Schiographia universalis*, or a mechanical method of delineating houses on any surface by fire, and a kind of omnibus tool-chariot set in motion by horse power.

Emanuel, certainly, had not yet commenced his dream-life. He started out a very practical materialist, indeed.

In 1715, being now twenty-seven years old, he re-entered his father's house, having received the appointment of assessor in the Royal School of Miners from the hands of the king. In addition to his daily duties, he found time to indulge in speculation. The nature of his studies is indicated by the titles of numerous pamphlets published:—"Attempts to find the Longitude by means of the Moon;" "On the Level of the Sea and the Great Tides of the Ancient World;" "A Proposal for the Division of Money and Measures so as to facilitate Calculation and Fractions." His brother-in-law, Benzelius, having spoken against some of his schemes, drew out this brave reply:—

"It is a little discouraging to be dissuaded thus. For myself, I desire all possible novelties, ay, a novelty for every day in the year, provided the world will be pleased with them. In every age there's an abundance of persons who follow the beaten track, and remain in the old way; but perhaps there are only from six to ten in a century who bring forward new things founded on argument and reason." He falls out with his father's house and country, because his speculations and inventions find no favor or patronage. "Should I be able to collect the necessary means, I have made up my mind to go abroad and seek my fortune in mining. He must indeed be a fool, who is loose and irresolute, who sees his place abroad, yet remains in obscurity and wretchedness at home, where the furies, Envy

and Pluto, have taken up their abode, and dispose of all rewards, where all the trouble I have taken is rewarded with shabbiness."

His disposition becomes more manifest still in the following extract:—"I have taken a little leisure this summer to put a few things on paper, which I think will be my last productions, for speculations and inventions like mine find no patronage nor bread in Sweden, and are considered by a number of political blockheads as a sort of school-boy exercise, which ought to stand quite in the background, while their finesse and intrigues step forward."

He leaves his ungrateful country for a tour of fifteen months on the Continent, visiting Amsterdam, Leipsic, Liege, and Cologne. Numerous Pamphlets were trailed along, one of which is headed, "New Attempts to explain the Phenomena of Physics and Chemistry by Geometry," and another, "A New Method of finding the Longitude of Places on Land or at Sea by Lunar Observations." He returned to Sweden in 1722, and during the next twelve years—from his thirty-fourth to his forty-sixth year—he remained silent, though not idle. In this duodecimal period he prepared his three folios of the "Principia" and the "Opera Philosophica et Mineralia," which were published at Leipsic in 1734.

At his father's death, in 1735, having inherited a sufficient fortune to follow inclination, and bent on penetrating Nature to the core, he starts again on a tour, taking in Brussels, Paris, Turin, Milan, Venice, and Rome. Besides visiting theatres and operas, he occupied his time in studying Anatomy, reading and translating the works of the best authors, as well as entering the dissecting-rooms. Thus another seven years of his life were passed. In 1741 he gave to the world these results, in his "Economy of the Animal Kingdom," at Amsterdam, and in 1744 followed it with his "Animal Kingdom."

Not pretending to convey any notion of the matter of Swedenborg's writings, as thus far noted, we would call their atten-

tion to their intellectual character in the estimate of Dr. Maudsley. "Undoubtedly he possessed in a remarkable degree some of the elements of greatness which have existed in the greatest men; a wonderful originality of conception; a mind not subjugated by details and formulas, but able to rise above the trammels of habits and systems of thought; an extraordinary faculty of assimilation; a vast power of grasping analogies; a sincere love of knowledge; an unwearied industry, and a matchless daring. Having all these qualities, but entirely lacking intellectual self-restraint, he is scientifically as sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal; his originality unchecked degenerated into riotous fancy; his power of rising above systems passed into a disregard or disdain of patiently-acquired facts; though his industry was immense, he never more than half learned what he applied himself to, never patiently and faithfully assimilated the details of what was known, but seduced by his love of analogies and sustained by his boundless self-sufficiency, he was carried away into empty theories and groundless speculations."

This may be taken as a fair verdict, since the Baron, when he was subsequently admitted to the Spiritual World, himself discovered his speculations to be vain and fanciful, however firmly his disciples may still continue to perceive in them marks of superhuman philosophic insight and mysterious anticipations of important scientific discoveries.

And yet, that we may again see how Doctors disagree, let us hear the philosopher, Emerson. He speaks of Swedenborg as one who "seemed, by the variety and amount of his powers, to be a composition of several persons—like the giant fruits which are matured in gardens by the union of four or five single blossoms;" as one "who anticipated much science of the nineteenth century; anticipated in astronomy the discovery of the seventh planet; anticipated the views of modern astronomy in regard to the generation of the earth by the sun; in magnetism, some important conclusions of later students; in chemistry, the galvanic theory; in anatomy, the discoveries of Schlichting,

Munro and Wilson; and first demonstrated the office of the lungs."

"A colossal soul, he lies abroad on his times, uncomprehended by them, and requires a long focal distance to be seen; suggests, as Aristotle, Bacon, Selden, Humboldt, that a certain vastness of learning, or *quasi* omnipresence of the human soul in Nature is possible. * * * One of the mastodons of literature, he is not to be measured by whole colleges of ordinary scholars. His stalwart presence would flutter the gowns of a university. Our books are false by being fragmentary; their sentences are *bon mots*, and not parts of natural discourse, or childish expressions of surprise and pleasure in Nature. But Swedenborg is systematic, and respective of the world in every sentence; all the means are orderly given; his faculties work with astronomic punctuality; and his admirable writing is pure from all pertness or egotism."

Dr. Maudsley is out of all patience with such words of eulogy. He declares them untrue, out and out. The slow and tedious course of scientific discovery militates against the correctness of such panegyric. Only by an unpardonable anachronism, he holds, and by throwing Swedenborg back into the middle ages, or ignoring the intellectual development of his time, and looking on his writings as the Mussulman looks on his Koran, can we thus glory over his positive scientific acquirements. He would have us bear in mind that Swedenborg did *not* live and flourish in the thirteenth, but in the eighteenth century, cotemporary with Newton and Halley in science, with Berkeley, Hume and Kant in philosophy. This kept in mind, the roomy and vague romancings of Swedenborg about magnetism, chemistry, astronomy, anatomy, and everything, compared with the exact knowledge that existed concerning them at the time, will then appear in their superficial, defective, nude, barren and fanciful character.

But we must pass on now to another part of his history—we had almost said to another Swedenborg. The Philosopher becomes

a seer. Like the Apostle of the Gentiles, he and his work are henceforth of a heavenly calling and ordering. His conversion was in this wise:—"One night in London, after he had dined heartily, a kind of mist spread before his eyes, and the floor of his room was covered with hideous reptiles, such as serpents, toads and the like." "I was astonished, having all my wits about me, and being perfectly conscious. The darkness attained its height, and then passed away. I now saw a man sitting in the corner of the chamber. As I had thought myself entirely alone, I was greatly frightened, when he said to me, 'Eat not so much.' My sight again became dim, and when I recovered it I found myself alone in the room."

This revelation was repeated the following night. "I was this time not at all alarmed. The man said, 'I am God, the Lord, the Creator and Redeemer of the world. I have chosen thee to unfold to men the spiritual sense of the Holy Scriptures. I will myself dictate to thee what thou shalt write.'

Thenceforth he abandoned all worldly learning and labored only in spiritual things. The Lord had opened his spiritual eyes, that he might see the phenomena of the other world, and to converse with angels and spirits.

In 1858 a Diary kept by Swedenborg himself, between 1743 and 1744, was discovered and purchased for the Royal Library at Stockholm. It contains visions and dreams, and their interpretations. They run through the gamut, from the lowest tone of melancholy to the highest pitch of angelic ecstasy. Some are the cream of bliss and happiness; others are the essence of distress. Now it is all temptation, persecution, and suffering, then again, it is all filth and obscenity. Certain passages in the "Diary" are of such a character as to be quite unfit for publication, or suitable only for the pages of a medical journal. The entries break suddenly for the space of three weeks. Why is this? He was lodging at the house of a person named Brockmer, in Fetter Lane, who, twenty-four years afterwards, related the following story to Mathesius, a Swedish clergyman. This is known in history as

BROCKMER'S NARRATIVE.

It is testified to by the said Mathesius, an honest and trustworthy man, in the name and presence of Mr. Burgman, a minister of the German church, the Savoy, London, while Swedenborg lived, dated Stora Hallfara, Aug. 27, 1796.

Wesley tells us what he knows in the following extract:—
“Many years ago the Baron came over to England, and lodged at one Mr. Brockmer's, who informed me (and the same information was given me by Mr. Mathesius, a very serious Swedish clergyman, both of whom were alive when I left London, and, I suppose, are so still) that while he was in his house he had a violent fever; in the height of which, being delirious totally, he broke from Mr. Brockmer, ran into the street stark naked, proclaimed himself the Messiah, and rolled himself in the mire.”

But let the reader peruse the famous “Narrative” entire:—

“In the year 1744 one of the Moravian brethren, named Seniff, made acquaintance with Mr. Emanuel Swedenborg while they were passengers in a party-yacht from Holland to England. Mr. Swedenborg, who was a God-fearing man, wished to be directed to some house in London where he might live quietly and economically. Mr. Seniff brought him to me, and I cheerfully took him in. Mr. Swedenborg behaved very properly in my house. Every Sunday he went to the Church of the Moravian Brothers in Fetter Lane. He kept solitary, yet came often to me, and in talking, expressed much pleasure in hearing the Gospel in London. So he continued for several months, approving of what he heard at the Chapel.

“One day he said to me he was glad the Gospel was preached to the poor, but complained of the learned and rich, who, he thought, must go to hell. Under this idea he continued for several months. He told me he was writing a small Latin book, which would be gratuitously distributed among the learned men in the universities of England.

"After this he did not open the door of his chamber for two days, nor allow the maid-servant to make the bed and dust, as usual.

"One evening, when I was in the coffee-house, the maid ran in to call me home, saying that something strange must have happened to Mr. Swedenborg. She had several times knocked at his door, without his answering, or opening it.

"Upon this I went home, and knocked at his door, and called him by name. He then jumped out of bed, and I asked him if he would not allow the servant to enter and make his bed. He answered, 'No,' and desired to be left alone, for he had a great work on hand.

"This was about nine in the evening. Leaving his door and going up-stairs, he rushed up after me, making a fearful appearance. His hair stood upright, and he foamed round his mouth. He tried to speak, but could not utter his thoughts, stammering long before he could get out a word.

"At last he said that he had something to confide to me privately, namely, that he was the Messiah, that he was come to be crucified for the Jews, and that I (since he spoke with difficulty) should be his spokesman, and go with him to-morrow to the synagogue, there to preach his words.

"He continued: 'I know you are an honest man, for I am sure you love the Lord, but I fear you believe me not.'

"I now began to be afraid, and considered a long time ere I replied. At last I said:

"'You are, Mr. Swedenborg a somewhat aged man, and, as you tell me, have never taken medicine; wherefore, I think some of a right sort would do you good. Dr. Smith is near; he is your friend and mine; let us go to him, and he will give you something fitted for your state. Yet shall I make this bargain with you: if the angel appears to me and delivers the message you mention, I shall obey the same; if not, you shall go with me to Dr. Smith in the morning.' He told me several times the angel would appear to me, whereupon we took leave of each other and went to bed.

"In expectation of the angel, I could not sleep, but lay awake the whole night. My wife and children were at the same time very ill, which increased my anxiety. I rose about five o'clock in the morning.

"As soon as Mr. Swedenborg heard me move overhead he jumped out of bed, threw on a gown, and ran in the greatest haste up to me, with his night-cap half on his head, to receive the news about my call.

"I tried by several remarks to prepare his excited mind for my answer. He foamed again and again, 'But how—how—how?' Then I reminded him of our agreement to go to Dr. Smith. At this he asked me straight down, 'Came not the vision?' I answered, 'No; and now I suppose you will go with me to Dr. Smith.' He answered, 'I will not go to any doctor.'

"He then spoke a long while to himself. At last he said: 'I am now associating with His spirits, one on the right hand and the other on the left. One asks me to follow you, for you are a good fellow; the other says I ought to have nothing to do with you, because you are good for nothing.'

"I answered, 'Believe neither of them, but let us thank God, who has given us power to believe in His Word.'

"He then went down stairs to his room, but returned immediately and spoke, but so confusedly that he could not be understood. I began to be frightened, suspecting that he might have a penknife or other instrument to hurt me. In my fear I addressed him seriously, requesting him to walk down stairs, as he had no business in my room. Then Mr. Swedenborg sat down in a chair and wept like a child, and said, 'Do you believe that I will do you any harm?' I also began to weep. It commenced to rain very hard.

"After this I dressed. When I came down I found Mr. Swedenborg also dressed, sitting in an arm-chair, with a great stick in his hand and the door open. He called, 'Come in, come in,' and waved the stick. I wanted to get a coach, but Mr. Swedenborg would not accompany me.

"I then went to Dr. Smith. Mr. Swedenborg went to the Swedish Envoy, but was not admitted, it being post day. Departing thence, he pulled off his clothes and rolled himself in very deep mud in a gutter. Then he distributed money from his pockets among the crowd which had gathered.

"In this state some of the footmen of the Swedish Envoy chanced to see him, and brought him to me very foul with filth. I told him that a good quarter had been taken for him near Dr. Smith, and asked him if he was willing to live there. He answered, 'Yes.' I sent for a coach, but Mr. Swedenborg would walk, and with the help of two men he reached his new lodging.

"Arrived there, he asked for a tub of water and six towels, and, entering one of the inner rooms, locked the door, and in spite of all entreaties would not open it. In fear lest he should hurt himself, the door was forced, when he was discovered washing his feet, and the towels all wet. He asked for six more. I went home, and left six men as guards over him. Dr. Smith visited him, and administered some medicine, which did him much good.

"I went to the Swedish Envoy, told him what had happened, and required that Mr. Swedenborg's rooms, in my house, might be sealed. The Envoy was infinitely pleased with my kindness to Mr. Swedenborg, thanked me very much for all my trouble, and assured me that the sealing of Mr. Swedenborg's chamber was unnecessary, as he had heard well of me, and had me in perfect confidence.

"After this I continued to visit Mr. Swedenborg, who, at last, had only one keeper. He many times vowed his gratitude for the trouble I had with him. He would never leave the tenet, however, that he was Messiah.

"One day, when Dr. Smith had given him a laxative, he went out into the fields and ran about so fast that his keeper could not follow him. Mr. Swedenborg sat down on a stile and laughed. When his man came near him, he rose to another stile, and so on.

"When the dog-days began, he became worse and worse. Afterward I associated very little with him. Now and then we met in the streets, and I always found he retained his former opinion."

Such is Brockmer's sad story, confirmed by the Swedish Pastor Mathesius and John Wesley. Its veracity, we are told, cannot be impugned. It fills out the break in Swedenborg's diary, and accords in spirit with his former entries. It, if true, tells but too plainly that madness, slowly and gradually developing, broke out in an acute mania in the fifty-sixth year of his life. Wesley speaks several times of the "violent fever which he had when he was fifty-five years old," as a fact well known.

In July, 1745, Swedenborg returned to Sweden, resigned his assessorship, abandoned all scientific pursuits, accounted all worldly interests and honors as worthless, and devoted himself exclusively to that sacred office, "to which the Lord Himself has called me; who was graciously pleased to manifest Himself to me, His unworthy servant, in a personal appearance in the year 1743; to open in me a sight of the spiritual world, and to enable me to converse with spirits and angels. * * * Hence it has been permitted me to hear and see things in another life which are astonishing, and which have never come to the knowledge of any man, nor entered into his imagination. I have been instructed concerning different kinds of spirits, and the state of souls after death—concerning hell, or the lamentable state of the unfaithful—concerning heaven, or the most happy state of the faithful, and particularly concerning the doctrine of faith, which is acknowledged throughout heaven." Leaving all else, he now calmly and seriously enters upon his great mission, than which none can be greater—that *through him the Lord Jesus Christ made His Second Advent for the Institution of a New Church, described in the Revelation under the figure of the New Jerusalem.*

Now he is the favorite of God. "An experience like mine

no one from creation has had," he asserts. And what was his experience? That of a seer, possessing the singular gift of seeing into and through the Spiritual World.

In 1749, Swedenborg published his first volume of his "*Arcana Cœlestia*," a work which came to its completion in eight volumes, the last appearing in 1756. London seems to have been his home for the time. He subsequently returned to Sweden, and, in 1761, took an active part as a member of the House of Nobles, in the deliberations of the Swedish diet. He soon ceased to attend, however, and retired. He built himself a small house in one of the suburbs of Stockholm, a gardener and his wife being his servants. He gave but little work and trouble, living on a simple diet, making his own coffee, which he drank freely, day and night, and dining usually on a small loaf of bread boiled in milk. He slept between blankets, not liking sheets, and, as he told the Rev. Mr. A. Ferelius, "never washed his face or hands, and never brushed his clothes, for no dirt or dust would stick to him." He paid little regard to day and night, sometimes sleeping through the one and working through the other, at other times, lying in bed for days together entranced. He talks aloud with the spirits, who caused him toothache, tried to enter his brain to kill him, tempted him to adultery and blasphemy.

His was not an unruffled course. It is recorded: "Sometimes he would weep bitterly and cry, with a loud voice, 'Lord, help me! O Lord, my God, forsake me not!' When seen in these states, he appeared as sick. When delivered from them, he would say, 'God be eternally praised!' All suffering has passed away. Be comforted, my friends; nothing happens to me which the Lord does not permit."

After one of these trials, he went to bed and did not rise for several days. His servants grew uneasy; perhaps he had died of fright; and they debated whether they should not summon his relatives, and force open the door. At length the gardener climbed to the window, and, to his great relief, saw his master

turn in bed. Next day he rang the bell. The wife went to the room, and related how anxious they had been, to which he cheerfully replied, "he had been very well, and had wanted for nothing."

He was accessible, and free with visitors. Women, however, were not admitted to his company. His general topic of conversation was his intercourse with the spiritual world. A positive test of his pretended gifts and powers, nevertheless, he would smoothly evade. Nicholas Collin, a student of Upsal, and ardent admirer of his writings, visited him, and requested as a great favor, that he should mediate an interview with his brother, who had died a few months before. Swedenborg inquired what his motives were for such a communion. "Merely the gratification of my brotherly affection," said the young man, "and the satisfaction of exploring a scene so sublime and interesting to a serious mind." Swedenborg conceded the purity of his motives, but did not deem them weighty enough to solicit a communication. Nothing short of a matter, important to the temporal and spiritual concern of the subject, was able to move him to consult the angels, who regulate these things. Lavater, who addressed him from Zurich, with a great deal of respect and sincerity, directed four pointed questions which he was anxious to have answered, but he was no more successful, Swedenborg did not answer. A second letter, of like nature, was likewise left unanswered. To a Minister of State, who applied to him for information concerning a certain young prince, who had mysteriously disappeared, he replied that the young man was in a spiritual circle, to which he had no access; that the angels did not know that circle; and that the matter was too small to trouble the Lord with. Liberal as he was with Revelations when no effort for detection or trial was at hand, he evaded or shirked a test.

About 1771, during the beginning of August, Swedenborg visited England for the last time. He resided in Cold Bath Fields, a place he had lived at during a former stay, at the

house of Richard Shearsmith, a wig-maker. There, on a Christmas Eve, he had a stroke of apoplexy which deprived him of the power of speech, and produced paralysis. He rallied for a time, but on the 27th of March, 1772, he quietly died, on the day, it is said, he predicted. His servant says of the event: "He was as pleased as I should have been if I was going to have a holiday or going to some merry-making." Thus lived and died this singular man. His works are left us, however, from which we must form our estimate of the author. He confronts us as a Scientist and Seer, under which two-fold character he must be judged separately.

He claimed, at one time, to have analyzed, examined and mastered nature. In his "*Principia*" he undertakes to investigate the Elemental Kingdom. Nature's method is everywhere the same, he holds. Hence Analogy is his mode of reasoning. In Suns, Planets and Particles, Nature is ever similar to herself. Size is nothing. The same ratio exists between 1,000,000 and 5,000,000 as there is between .0,000,001 and .0,000,005; what is true of the least is true of the greatest. Since then, the whole world is mechanical, even the intangible particles must be so, too; visible matter is geometrical as to figure, mechanical as to motion; therefore invisible matter must be so also. Everything in Nature originated in points as lines and forms, in geometry, originate in points. These points are immediate products from the Infinite. The Infinite produces a congress of points, or First Finites; and from these grew an order of Second Finites; from these a series of Third Finites, and so on, until the world became a fact.

It is easy to see the weak link in his chain. He does not tell us how he gets his point produced from the Infinite. He postulates whenever he pleases. Analogies are arguments for him. He imagines, concludes, declares, and very often forgets all about the verification and proof. We mean him no harm, but involuntarily we were haunted by a certain bold, bad man, who dealt out this advice: "Talk! Talk! Talk! Some will stick!"

Some of Swedenborg's teachings did hold out, and do yet, even though we subsequently pronounced his speculations vain and idle. As a writer on Anatomy and Physiology he is far above many of later days. The human body is for him *a living organization*—a vital harmony. Still, time, which tests all things, has not dealt kindly with his wisdom. His publications were received with indifference, and men of to-day, engaged seriously and scientifically, will hardly sit down soberly to a table of imagination run riot, as it seems to them.

But who will deny him a comprehensive grandeur of method? He drank at the fountain of all sciences. If an Emerson sees so much in an author as he tells us he recognizes in Swedenborg, we must, at all events, not dismiss him with contempt, or pronounce him a trimmer. And, what is very significant Swedenborg never pretended to write for his day, or expected to be appreciated by his cotemporaries. But, still he looked for a day in which he *would* be recognized. Nor can any serious student deny, that Swedenborg's writings are just now beginning to be studied and respected. Even Carlyle acknowledges that he greatly wronged the man, by severely ignoring him. Carlyle seldom begs any man's pardon, remember!

His subsequent career now claims our notice—as a seer. Here the celebrated "Brockmer's Narrative" does us good service. But it is necessary to know something more of the character of his dreams, which his Diary furnishes. Here is one specimen:—

"I went to bed.* * * Half an hour after I heard a tumbling noise under my head. I thought it was the Tempter going away. Immediately, a violent trembling came over me from head to foot with a great noise. This happened several times. I felt as if something holy were over me. I then fell asleep, and about 12, 1, or 2, the tremblings and the noise were repeated indescribably. I was prostrated on my face, and at that moment I became wide-awake and perceived that I was thrown down, and wondered what was the meaning. I spoke as if awake, but felt that these words were put into my mouth:—

“ ‘Thou, Almighty Jesus Christ, who, by Thy great mercy, deigns to come to so great a sinner, make me worthy of Thy grace.’

“I kept my hands together in prayer, and then a hand came forward and firmly pressed mine. I continued my prayer, saying:—

“ ‘Thou hast promised to have mercy upon all sinners; Thou canst not but keep Thy word.’

“At that moment I sat in His bosom, and saw Him face to face. It was a face of holy mien and altogether indescribable, and He smiled, so that I believe His face had indeed been like this when He lived on Earth. * * * *

“So I concluded it was the Son of God Himself, who came down with the noise like thunder, who prostrated me on the ground, and who called forth the prayer.”

The above vision, of the 7th of April, 1744, was of the better sort. It is to be regretted that all his nightly trances were not of this class. Here is one of another stripe:—

“I had horrible dreams; how an executioner roasted the heads which he had struck off, and hid them one after another in an oven, which was never filled. It was said to be food. There was a big woman who laughed, and had a little girl with her.”

“I had troublesome dreams about dogs, that were said to be my countrymen, and which sucked my neck without biting.*** In the morning, I had horrid thoughts, that the Evil One had got hold of me, yet with the confidence that he was outside of me and would let me go. Then I fell into the most damnable thoughts, the worst that could be.”

His sensual dreams are numerous, the recital of which are of such a character as to be quite unfit for the public eye. Another nocturnal experience is thus related:—

“When I was about to go to sleep, it was stated that certain spirits were conspiring to kill me; but, because I was secure, I feared nothing, and fell asleep. About the middle of the

night, I awoke and felt that I did not breathe from myself, but, as I believed, from Heaven. It was then plainly told me that the whole hosts of spirits had conspired to suffocate me, and as soon as they had made the attempt, a heavenly respiration was opened in me, and they were defeated."

The spirits tried hard to make a thief out of Swedenborg. He tells us:—"I observed that certain spirits often wished to excite me to steal things of small value, such as are met within shops; and so great was their desire that they actually moved my hand. I ascertained that in the world these spirits had been tradespeople, who by various artifices defrauded their customers, and thought it allowable. Some had been celebrated merchants, at which I wondered. * * * When they werewith me, as soon as I saw anything in shops, or any pieces of money, or the like, their cupidity became manifest to me; for thinking themselves to be me, they urged that I should stretch forth my hand to steal, quite contrary to my usual state and custom."

The spirits perverted his senses often. "It has sometimes, yea rather often," says he, "happened that what had tasted well has been changed in my mouth to what is nasty, or to another taste. Since, if I mistake not, sugar tasted almost like salt. The liquid I drank had infused into it a salty taste expressed by spirits from the juices of the body. * * * The taste of man is thus changed according to the phantasies of spirits."

Suicide was urged upon by his nightly companions, as well as during their daily visit. Hear him tell his sore trials in this direction:—

"It was often observed that, when I was in the streets, evil spirits wished to cast me under the wheels of carriages; the effort was, in fact, habitual to them. To-day, I noticed particularly that they were in the constant endeavor to do so. I was enabled to perceive that evil spirits made the attempts, and that indeed such mischief is their life." * * * *

"Some time before, the faculty of conversing with spirits

was opened in me. I was impelled to commit suicide with a knife. The impulse grew so strong that I was forced to hide the knife out of sight in my desk.

"I have now discovered that Sarah Herselia was the spirit who excited the suicidal impulse as often as I saw the knife. From this it may appear that men may be unconsciously infested with spirits who hated them during their life on earth."

His war with the Quakers is amusing, until it becomes so obscene and filthy as to disgust the reader. Here is but a taste of the narrative on this point:—

"When I awoke in the night, I found in the hair of my head a multitude of very small snakes. It was perceived that Quaker spirits had been plotting against me, while I was asleep, but without effect. It was only by their phantasies that they were among my hair where I felt them.

"The secret worship of the Quakers, sedulously concealed from the world, was made manifest. It is a worship so wicked, execrable, and abominable, that, were it known to Christians, they would expel Quakers from society, and permit them to live only among beasts.

"They have a vile communion of wives." * * * *

The reader will not wonder at this harshness towards his fellows, when he comes to learn the little respect or reverence Swedenborg shows, even towards prophets, apostles, and other spiritual worthies. He was above all such holy characters, since his mission was the very highest that could be allotted to man. The Lord Jesus Christ had made His Second Advent for the Institution of the New Church, typified under the New Jerusalem in Revelation, in him. Yea, he was the Messiah. Had he not come in the year 1757—the year in which the Last Judgment occurred in the world of spirits? Why should he bow before any spirit—David and Paul not excepted?

"David is possessed with the lust," says Swedenborg, "of being chief in heaven. * * * Persuaded that he was a god, he proclaimed himself one."

"When I went to bed, evil spirits formed a design to destroy me, and for this end took measures to call out hell, and every malicious spirit. * * * They evoked David also, who appeared before me in a dense cloud."

Paul is thus disposed of:—

"A certain devil fancied himself the very devil who deceived Adam and Eve. * * * It was given me to hear Paul speaking with him, and saying he wished to be his companion, and that they would go together and make themselves gods."

"During my sleep I have been infested by adulterers, and this devil and Paul have lent their aid to my infesters, and so stubbornly held me in an adulterous train of thought that I could scarcely release myself. * * * Hence Paul's nefarious character was made known."

"Paul is among the worst of the apostles, as has been made known to me by large experience. * * * Besides, he connected himself with one of the worst devils, would fain rule all things, and pledged himself to obtain for him his end. It would be tedious for me to write all I know about Paul."

It is well to know too the *kind* of Spiritual World which Swedenborg entered and became so familiar with. It is wholly man-made, and not as good a sphere as the Natural World, by much. Not far away lies his mysterious region, into which Swedenborg continually went, and that, too, without going away. A certain writer remarks:—"Swedenborg's representation of the spiritual world needs an inscription, like to that painter's picture of a lion, which needed the 'This is a Lion,' underneath." A man daring enough to make a Heaven or a Hell, a Spiritual World out and out, he, surely, needs no additional boldness to make its denizens as he wants them. Aside of Virgil's portraitures, or Dante's, or even Jacob Behmen's, Swedenborg's is a miserable daub. Mahomet, indeed, exceeds the Baron's efforts immeasurably. Wesley's remark is in point here:—"His ideas of heaven are low, grovelling, just suiting to a Mohammedan paradise." * * * * "His dreams—just as

authentic as Quevedo's "Visions of Hell." The less spiritually one is minded, it seems, the more readily one will incline to Swedenborg's manufactured spiritual order. It is the nearest approach to a spiritual world that is not spiritual at all, that can possibly be made. It is, in fact, only *another* natural world. "The whole natural world corresponds," says he, "to the spiritual world collectively and in every part; for the natural world exists and subsists from the spiritual world, just as an effect does from its cause." . . .

"Whenever I have been in company with angels, the objects in heaven appeared so exactly like those in the world, that I knew no other than that I was on earth."

"There is so little difference between the life of the spirit and the life of the body, that those who have died can hardly realize that a change has been made."

"A man is equally a man after death, and a man so perfectly that he knows no other than that he is still on earth. He sees, hears and speaks as on earth; he walks, runs, and sits as on earth; he eats and drinks as on earth; he sleeps and wakes as on earth; he enjoys sexual delights as on earth; in short, he is a man in general and every particular as on earth, whence it is plain that death is a continuation of life, and a mere transit to another plane of being."

It is, indeed, no hardship for us to concede that Swedenborg possessed the gift (?) of entering into and interpreting the mysteries of a spiritual world—such a world as it was!

Nevertheless, it would be a great mistake to suppose that all which he says in his "*Arcana Cœlestia*" is equally foolish, absurd, and wicked. There is much of a very different character. Consider, for example, how nicely he discourses on *character*. This is the only passport to heaven. Virtue in man is of the good angel; Vice, of a bad angel. The heavenly life cannot enter the infernally formed soul. Many of the first on earth, apparently, are the last, actually, in that plane and sphere. The Lord, indeed, permits man to go where he pleases;

He never saves nor damns. "When, however, they make the attempt, they are seized at the threshold with such anguish that, in their torment, they cast themselves down headlong." No change of character is possible after death. To change it is to destroy it. Man is himself; he takes with him, as it were, tastes, feelings, habits and opinions. The heavenly-minded here will be heavenly habited there—and they only. The angels know him instantly. There is something solemn in the manner in which these heavenly inquisitors read a man. He puts it very nervously:—

"When a man's deeds are discovered after death, his angels, who are inquisitors, look into his face, and extend their examination over his whole body, beginning with the fingers of each hand. I was surprised at this, and the reason was thus explained to me:—

"'Every volition and thought of man is inscribed on his brain; for volition and thought have their beginnings in the brain, whence they are conveyed to the bodily members, wherein they terminate. Whatever, therefore, is in the mind is in the brain, and from the brain into the body, according to the order of its parts. Thus, a man writes his life in his physique, and thus the angels discover his autobiography in his structure.'"

His Scriptural Commentaries would hardly pass for orthodox. We will furnish the reader with some specimens of these too. Three senses are to be discerned in the Word, the literal, the spiritual and the celestial. After this rule let him render the Decalogue:—

"By the fourth commandment, in the spiritual sense, is meant the regeneration and reformation of man. The work of regeneration is successive." * * * "Answering in its several stages to man's conception, formation in the womb, his birth, and his education. The first act of the new birth is reformation; the second act of it is regeneration."

"In a spiritual sense, by honoring father and mother is meant

revering and loving God and the Church. In a celestial sense, by father is meant God; by mother, the communion of saints."

"The celestial meaning of the sixth commandment is, Thou shalt not hate God.

"Committing adultery, in a spiritual sense, is adulterating the word of God.

"Stealing, in the celestial sense, is the taking away divine power from the Lord.

"In Scripture, by a garden, a grove, woods, are meant, wisdom, intelligence, science; by the olive, the vine, the cedar, the poplar, and the oak, are meant the good and truth of the church, under the different characters of celestial, spiritual, rational, natural, and sensual; by a lamb, an ox, a sheep, a calf, a goat, are meant innocence, charity, and natural affection; by Egypt, is signified what is scientific; by Ashur, what is rational; by Edom, what is natural; by Moab, the adulteration of good; by Ammon, the adulteration of truth; by Jacob, is meant the church natural; by Israel, the church spiritual; and by Judah, the church celestial."

The damnable heresy, according to the Baron, is the Dogma of the Trinity. He excludes all who believe in it from salvation.

OF GOD THE CREATOR,

we are told, "God is one, in essence and person, and Jesus Christ is He. Jesus Christ is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

* * * The Church is now in so ruinous a state, that there are scarce any traces left of its ancient glory. And this has come to pass, in consequence of their dividing the Divine Trinity into three persons, each of which is declared to be God and Lord. This is the true source of all the Atheism in the world."

"The Nicene and Athanasian doctrine concerning Trinity, have given birth to a faith which has entirely overturned the Christian church."

"He that confirmeth himself into a plurality of gods, by a

plurality of persons, becomes like a statue formed with movable joints, in the midst of which Satan stands and speaks through its mouth."

"In the spiritual world (which lies mid-way between heaven and hell, having heaven above and hell below,) are climates and zones as in the natural. The frigid zones are the habitation of those spirits, who, while on earth were lazy and indolent. Having once a desire to visit them, I was carried in the spirit to a region covered with snow. It was on the Sabbath day; and I saw a number of men, that is, human spirits, who had their heads covered with lions' skins, by reason of the cold; their bodies, with the skins of leopards; and their legs and feet with bears' skins. I also observed several riding in chariots, made in the shape of dragons with horns; they were drawn by small horses without tails, which ran with the impetuosity of terrible fierce beasts. They were all flocking toward a church, in which hung a tablet inscribed, 'A Divine Being, consisting of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in essence one, but in persons three.'"

And a still worse fate awaits some Trinitarians, beyond the riding in gigs and chaises. Of one poor soul, he says:—"I once saw a spirit as lightning falling from heaven. I asked him the reason of it. He replied: I was cast down, because I believed that God the Father and God the Son are two persons."

OF THE LORD THE REDEEMER,

we are told much of this order:—"The Lord received His soul from Jehovah, and the divinity of the Father was the Lord's soul."

"The humanity whereby God sent Himself into the world was the Son of God."

"The passion of the cross was the final temptation which the Lord endured as the Grand Prophet; and it was the means of the glorification of His humanity; that is, of its union with the divinity of the Father."

Let us hear somewhat, OF THE HOLY GHOST.

"The Holy Ghost is not God Himself, but the divine operation of God.

The Holy Ghost is divine truth. Therefore, our Lord Himself is also the Holy Ghost.

"The divine operation, signified by the Holy Ghost, consists in reformation and regeneration; and, in proportion as these are effected, in renovation, vivification, sanctification, and justification; and, in proportion as these are effected, in purification from evils, remission of sins, and final salvation."

A late writer thus briefly sums up Swedenborg's theories:—

Swedenborgianism is Unitarianism. "God is one in Essence and in Person. In Him there is, however, a Trinity, distinct and essential, called the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Lord Jesus Christ is this God, whom we must worship. There is no vicarious atonement; no justification by faith. A large portion of the Canon is ignored, and the received parts are supplemented, as it were, in their plain and literal rendering, by an inner and spiritualistic sense. The law of correspondence between things natural and things spiritual is greatly emphasized. The doctrine of the Resurrection is rejected, as commonly held. At death each individual leaves back his gross, material body, and enters, after a brief interval, upon his eternal state. Once in it, the experience and history of the man is similar to his earthly career, only on a higher plain. All Swedenborgianism stands in Emanuel Swedenborg, and falls with him too. He is the first and last of it. This is what condemns it in the eyes of all—save, of course, in those of the initiated."

REDEMPTION.

This is bringing the hells under subjection, and reducing the heavens into order. His passion on the cross was not the act of redemption; it lay in this rather, that He executed the last judgment in the spiritual world, separating the sheep from the goats, forming a new heaven of the former, and a new hell of the latter.

"The Lord is now accomplishing redemption; that is, subduing the hells, and bringing the heavens into order; which was begun in the year 1757, together with the last judgment executed at the same time."

We will merely add the Baron's narrative of a soul in the "Great Beyond," in substance and briefly:—

There are three heavens and three hells. A soul enters the spiritual world without knowing of its new home, for some days. The knowledge comes presently, and the realization is that the spirit is *between* the heavens and the hells. Then begins a journey, or visitation rather. The spirit is led about to various circles, good and bad, in order to learn its affinity. If the drawing is towards a good society, the introduction is consummated, first in this grade of goodness, and then in that, until a society is found, corresponding with its own natural level. There a disrobing of the natural, and a clothing upon by the spiritual finds place, and the soul enters heaven. A bad man has a similar experience, and history, but in a contrary direction. Those of authority and power, in this life, are set over societies and orders beyond; but as they betray a weakness, they are degraded. After several such experiences, they are ready to retire in sadness, till they are translated to a desert, and dwell there in cottages. They are put to work now; and as they are diligent and faithful, they are fed. If indifferent and lazy, they are fasted well-nigh to starvation. No work, no bread. "Hell consists of * * * * endless work-houses." "Some are set to prepare vermilion, and to mix it into a paint for the faces of harlots."

Our final extract shall be Swedenborg's photograph of the Devil:—

"Satan was once permitted to ascend out of hell with a woman to my house. She was of the tribe of Sirens, who can assume all figures, and all habits of beauty and ornament. All such are harlots in the world of spirits. I asked Satan if the woman was his wife. He answered, 'Neither I, nor any of

our society have wives; she is my —. She then inspired him with wanton —, and he kissed her and cried, 'Ah, my Adonis!' I said, what do thou and thy companions think of God? He said, 'God, heaven, angels, and the like, are all empty words.' I answered, 'O Satan, thou hast lost thy understanding; Recollect that thou hast lived in another world!' Immediately his recollection returned, and he saw his error. But the cloud soon returned upon his understanding, and he was just the same as before."

From the thread of his life, and the extracts of his works, we may form a summary estimate of his character. Above all men, in heaven and on earth, as he claims to be; beyond law and criticism and error, even, Swedenborg cannot get away from himself. He is his own best commentary and exhibition.

The founder of Methodism, in this way, tested him. "I sat down to read, and seriously to consider some of the writings of Baron Swedenborg. I began with huge prejudices in his favor, knowing him to be a pious man, and one of a strong understanding, of much learning, and one who thoroughly believed himself. But I could not hold out long. Any one of his visions puts his real character out of all doubt. He is one of the most ingenious madmen that ever set pen to a paper. But his waking dreams are so wild, so far remote, both from Scripture and common sense, that one might as easily swallow the stories of 'Tom Thumb' or 'Jack the Giant Killer.' * * * *

"I find but one instance of an insanity parallel to this: I mean that related by the Roman poet, of the gentleman at Argos, in other respects a sensible man—

*Tui se credebat miros audire Tragædos,
In vacuo lætus sensor plausorque Theatro,—*

who imagined himself to hear admirable tragedies, and undoubtedly saw as well as heard the actors, while he was sitting alone, and clapping them in the empty theater." To convince us that he meant him no ill, he says this for the Baron:—"He was a man of piety, of a strong understanding, and most lively

imagination; but he had a violent fever when he was five-and-fifty-years old, which quite overturned his understanding. Nor did he ever recover it; but it continued 'majestic, though in ruins.'"

But on the question of Swedenborg's insanity, he is decided. "I have abundant proof," he writes, "that Baron Swedenborg's fever, which he had thirty years before he died, much affected his understanding."

Maudsley likewise judges the man from his ancestry, history, and writings, and arrives at the same conclusion. He believes the father to have been thus predisposed already. The boy, Emanuel's, power of suspending his breath, borders nigh on *chorea*, and is to be regarded as an affliction, rather than as a gift. His whole "subsequent career, as seer and theologian, was the natural development of his character, but it was a morbid development, and the history which remains to be told, is the history of a learned and ingenious madman, the character of whose intellectual aberration testifies to the greatness of his original intellectual structure."

Relying on Spinoza's dictum, that the visions in a dream may remain and produce hallucinations after awakening, he reads this confession in Swedenborg's vagaries. "While dreams may be considered a temporary insanity, insanity is a waking dream, and there is a border land, in which they are so confounded as to be indistinguishable. * * * * The notable circumstances in connection with Swedenborg's dreamings, are the indistinguishable blending of dreams and waking visions, and the entire faith with which he accepts and interprets them as spiritual revelations. * * * * Even in the dirtiest details of an unchaste dream, he discovers a wonderful spiritual meaning. Had it not been for this spiritual interpretation of his dreams and visions, probably no one would ever have doubted the derangement of his intellect. * * * * Those, however, who reject angrily the supposition of any unsoundness of mind, must admit, if they know anything of its morbid phenomena,

that if he was not at this time, fast gliding into madness, he imitated exceeding well, the character of the incipient stages. But there is no need of conjecture, where something like certainty is attainable. "He then plants himself on the 'Brockmer's Narrative,' which proves an outbreak of acute insanity—a fruiting which might have been predicted by any medical psychologist, on the mere basis of what had transpired in the man before. If the 'Narrative' cannot be upset, there remains no doubt that Swedenborg was insane at the moment of his first pretended entrance into the spiritual world." After the acute attack had passed off, as it did in a few weeks, was he perfectly restored, or was he still the victim of a chronic mania or monomania, such as not unfrequently follows acute madness? "Two facts, according to Dr. M., forbid us to hope for an entire recovery: 1. The age of the patient; 2. The fact "that his madness was not a strange calamity coming on him unexpectedly from without, foreign to his nature, extrinsic, but that it was native to his character, the result of an unsound development of its tendencies—it was a natural, an intrinsic madness. In the former case, the *ego*, regaining power, may throw off the intruding affliction, and re-establish itself; in the latter, the mania absorbs and becomes the *ego*, wherefore, no return to entire sanity is possible. It was not then scientifically probable that Swedenborg would recover; it was, on the contrary, probable that he would suffer for the rest of his life, from the monomaniacal form of chronic mania."

From the facts broadly stated, to wit: that Swedenborg suddenly abandoned all his former pursuits, in the year 1744 or 1745; that he claimed to have been admitted to the spiritual world, and to have power to converse with angels; that his writings at this juncture savor of madness; and that he had indeed an acute attack of madness—from such *data*, Doctor M. asks—"Is it not reasonable to infer that his new and strange pretensions were the outcome of his madness?" Of course, says Dr. M., on the theory of his madness, all Swedenborg's

pretensions are quite consistent. "He lived and moved in the world, and saw it with his bodily eyes, as other persons see it; but his disordered intellect was continually occupied in spiritualistic recollections, to which his disordered imagination gave shape; the morbid creations being projected outward, and then represented as events of the spiritual world. * * * * His eyes were indeed opened to see what other people could not see, but the gift was nowise so singular as he imagined; every monomaniac being similarly gifted."

His good behaviour, rational course, in general, and sweet disposition, do not disconcert the doctor in the least. "The vulgar notion, says he, that a madman must be incoherent, or dangerous, or furious, prepared those who had read his extraordinary revelations, to find something strange in his behaviour; and when they were introduced to a calm and courteous old gentleman, who conversed sensibly on all ordinary subjects, and related his extraordinary spiritual experiences, with a quiet and assured confidence, they were naturally surprised, and found it hard to believe that his stories had not some real foundation. How little warranted by facts such a conclusion was, an hour's experience in a lunatic asylum would have proved to them."

Doctor Maudsley thinks, furthermore, that one not especially interested in him, would note all his eccentricities. On one of his voyages from Sweden to England, he had often been heard talking to himself. The steward and cabin-boy told the captain that their passenger was out of his mind. The reply was: "Out of his mind or not, as long as he is quiet, I have no power over him. He is always reasonable with me, and I have the best of weather when he is aboard."

His nephew, Bishop Filenius, and some of the clergy, once entertained the idea of sending him to an asylum on account of his doctrines; but happily it was never done.

From all that is said and written of Emanuel Swedenborg, for and against him, we may well expect the formula—"Lunatic

or Prophet." It is accordingly claimed that there is no middle ground. And yet, Dr. Brownson declares that Swedenborgianism and all other religious phenomena in Paganism, Moham-medanism, Protestantism, Spiritism, and every other territory, outside of the Roman Church, are but the fruitings of demonology. At furthest, then, we may regard him as a prophet of light or of darkness, it is claimed. And, verily, we feel like acquiescing in the verdict. But whether of the twain, we are not prepared to affirm.

The theory of a holy inspiration, alone satisfies his admirers. "Madness!" they exclaim. "Not so! All through his life we discern a consistent rising and ripening. From childhood, through youth, and into manhood, his has been an emerging from and out of the earthly, and an ascension into the spiritual. He mounted step by step from the study of the lowest forms of matter, to the investigation of its highest organic evolution. Verily, his 'new departure' was no departure at all, no abrupt breaking; but a natural fitting-on, a bright and blessed development, the glorious efflorescence of a life, perfectly in harmony with itself all through."

"Lunacy," it is persisted, on the other hand, "is the most charitable term that can be employed with reference to the man. With the Bible in one hand, and the life of Swedenborg in the other, we have no election. He is a good and learned, but mad man." With such a dilemma confronting us, it is, perhaps, wise to plead for a reopening of his case, on the part of the thinking world. It is on record, that the children have erected monuments over the tombs which the fathers had dug. And so, too, is it written, that from the second death there is no resurrection.

For our own self, we plead openly for a new trial, in the case of Swedenborg. Let the man and his works be studied by the thinking world, that it may become known whether he be a prophet of good, or of evil, or of neither; and in either or any event, to what degree a prophet of this, that, or the other. It

will result in a verdict as intelligent, as it will be in harmony with God's Word, we doubt not, no matter how many enigmas may remain unsolved in this singular man.

Nor need any earnest mind be startled at such a revision of Swedenborgianism. The gospel itself, must again be brought home to the mind and tribunal of our age. Not, indeed, to put the Divine System on trial, as it were, in order to discover whether it be a fact or a fable, do we mean; but rather that the gospel may be freed, in this way, from the disfigurements which its friends have unhappily inflicted, or its opponents ignorantly or maliciously clogged it with. The good genius of the XIX. century prays for such a consummation, which promises to result in a greater light than has ever dawned upon the Christian race before, in consequence of the proper understanding of the old and by-gone, which again will break the way for a new interpretation in the future. We do not see what should hinder the Christian scholar from considering what such a man as Emanuel Swedenborg may have contributed towards the grand result, as well as Adam Clarke, Matthew Henry, Richard Baxter, and a score of others. We do not fear the rejection of the Gospel, but hail, rather, the unfolding of its life-germ to men's hearts, that the race may find it to be indeed the bread and water of immortality.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

WAYSIDE GLEANINGS IN EUROPE BY BENJAMIN BAUSMAN, D. D.,
READING, PA.; DANIEL MILLER, 113 NORTH SIXTH STREET,
PHILADELPHIA; REFORMED CHURCH PUBLICATION BOARD,
907 ARCH STREET.

DR. BAUSMAN is known as a ready and rapid writer. His work, *Sinai and Zion*, had prepared us to expect an interesting volume from his pen when it was announced that he was about to publish this second volume, entitled *Wayside Gleanings*. But what is there to glean when the reaping has been so thorough? Besides, can a book be fresh which purports to give observations of Europe twenty years ago? These questions we asked ourselves, and we confess we had some misgivings as to the success of the new book; but these, all gave way when we sat down to read it. Europe does not change as rapidly as the United States. History there is not as here, like the rapidly flowing torrent from the mountain-side, but rather like the steadily flowing stream through the plane. The old homesteads of England and the villages of Germany are pretty much the same now as they were a century ago. Political changes there have been, but with these the author does not pretend to deal. He takes us to the cities, towns, and rural districts of Europe, and enables us to look in upon the manners and customs of the people. These, as we have said, undergo very little change, especially in the villages and rural districts. Kings and politicians come and go, but the people remain substantially the same.

The chapter in which the author describes his visit to the home of his ancestors in Germany, near Bingen-on-the-Rhine, is an illustration of what we have said. There stands the village and the village church as they stood when his father, then a youth, left them in the beginning of the century. The narrative of his meeting with the family of his uncle, his father's brother, is full of tender pathos. The reader seems to be transported to that little German village, and to join the throng of devout worshipers as they wend their way to the village church. He reads the description of their simple worship, and their manner of life, and he says to himself, these Germans are still religious and devout. Whatever may be the condition of the cities and learned people, these plain peasantry are not poisoned by the learned rationalism of many of the professors.

We are satisfied and pleased. Without making any great pretensions the writer has given us a spicy, readable and instructiv

volume on a trite theme. He has gleaned successfully, and the reader will be fully repaid for his time and labor in reading this book. We venture to say that very few who make the tour of Europe see as much as he saw, and can describe as well what they saw. We commend the book especially to his numerous friends in the Reformed Church.

GERMAN REVIEWS.—JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DEUTSCHE THEOLOGIE, No. 3, 1875.

The first article is a fitting tribute by Weizsäcker to the memory of *Dr. Christian Palmer*. Palmer was one of the original founders and editors of the "*Jahrbücher*," and during the twenty years' history of this celebrated German theological review, contributed numerous valuable articles to its pages. Born in 1811, he received his theological education in the University of Tübingen. For ten years he labored faithfully in the work of the ministry; but in 1852, after the death of Schmid, he was called to the chair of Practical Theology in Tübingen, where he toiled with German industry till his death, in May 29, 1875. The number and character of his literary productions prove him to have been a man of extraordinary diligence. He published valuable works on Homiletics, Catechetics, Pedagogics, Pastoral Theology, Christian Ethics, and Hymnology, besides issuing volumes of sermons and furnishing able contributions to Encyclopedias and Reviews. Palmer belonged to the so-called "Mediational School" in theology, which seeks to harmonize faith with science and culture. His point of view, however, was always that of Practical Theology. Weizsäcker rightly characterizes him as a late disciple of the older Tübingen School, represented by suchmen as Steudel, as distinguished from the modern Tübingen School of Baur. His personal character was blameless. Kind and gentle, he was yet severe toward all vulgarity, impurity and untruthfulness.

The second article of Prof. Sieffert, of Bonn, is an important contribution to the Biblical Theology of the New Testament. The subject discussed is "The Soteriological Significance of the Sufferings and Death of Christ, according to the First Epistle of Peter." The opinions of theologians in regard to the type of doctrine presented in this epistle are still widely divergent. What is the peculiar, characteristic manner in which the Apostle apprehends and sets forth the Christian doctrine? According to one, his doctrine is Jewish Christian, and is uninfluenced by Paulinism; according to another, it is simply a repetition of Pauline ideas. These are the extreme views between which the majority of Biblical theologians of the New Testament move, while they differ among themselves as to the degree in which Peter was influenced by Paul. To aid in settling the general question, Sieffert enters upon a careful investigation of

the doctrine of Peter, as contained in this epistle, so far as it relates to the suffering and death of Christ. His article, which extends over 70 pages, is worthy of close study.

An essay by Ritschl, in the third number of the "*Studien und Kritiken*" for 1875, on the prologue to the Gospel of John, furnishes the occasion for a few remarks by Wagenmann. The Apostle's course of thought is somewhat perplexing. Apparently it is twice interrupted, first by the introduction of the Baptist (vs. 6, 8), and again by v. 15. Various attempts have been made to meet the difficulty. Ritschl, following the precedent of Priestley, supposes a transposition, and arranges as follows:—*First*, The revelation of the Word to the Gentiles (vs. 1-5, 10); *Secondly*, The revelation to the people of Israel (vs. 11-13, 6-8); *Thirdly*, The revelation of the Word in the flesh (vs. 9, 14, 16-18, 15).

Wagenmann first eliminates vs. 6-8, 15, and thus obtains, as he thinks, a Christian *logos* psalm, rhythmically arranged according to the laws of Hebrew poetry in three strophes: *Strophe* 1, (vs. 1-5), The nature of the Word; *strophe* 2, (vs. 9-13), The coming of the Word; *strophe* 3, (vs. 14, 16-18), The incarnation of the Word and His dwelling among men. But how then are vs. 6-8, 15 to be regarded? Wagenmann thinks that if they were dropped, nothing essential would be lost. If they are retained they may be viewed 1, as a *gloss*, which stood originally in the margin, but at a later time crept into the text; or 2, as explanatory *parentheses* inserted by the author of the Gospel to prevent misconception; or 3, as a *transposition*. Wagenmann would place them between vs. 18 and 19, as a transition from the prologue to the historical narrative, and in the following order:—Vs. 18, 6, 7, 8, 15, 19.

"Remarks on Single Passages of the Gospel according to John," by Solms; and "A Historical Introduction to the Articles of Smalcald," by Sander, constitute the fourth and fifth articles, which are followed by the book notices.

THE BIBLE COMMENTARY—ISAIAH, JEREMIAH AND LAMENTATIONS.

This is the fifth volume of the so-called *Speakers' Commentary*. The general character of the work is already well known to the theological public. It is, of course, conservative. This was only to be expected from the occasion that gave it birth; for it was during the excitement called forth by Bishop Colenso's attacks on the Pentateuch that the idea of preparing this Commentary was suggested by the Speaker of the House of Commons. Yet it is not altogether inaccessible to modern criticism. At times it exhibits surprising freedom, especially in the criticism of the text. The work may be taken as fairly representing the Biblical learning of the English Church. The Commentary on Isaiah was prepared by Dr.

Kay; that on Jeremiah, as well as that on Lamentations, by Dr Smith, Dean of Canterbury. These names are a sufficient guarantee that the work is well done.

The ATLANTIC MONTHLY is one of our best American monthlies, and we may say *the best* in its own character. It aims to be a *literary* magazine of high order, and it has realized its aim. That it will go on its way into a still brighter future, we may infer both from what it has been, and from the prospectus, which we herewith insert:

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY FOR 1876.

W. D. HOWELLS will contribute a new American Novel, entitled "Private Theatricals," the scene of which is laid in a New England summer boarding-place, and will also furnish Sketches of Life and Character. MRS. FRANCES ANNE KEMBLE will continue her charming autobiographical papers, "Old Woman's Gossip," commenced in the August ATLANTIC. MARK TWAIN will add to his capital sketches of "Old Times on the Mississippi" some new papers in his inimitable vein. GEN. O. O. HOWARD will contribute in three papers his recollections of three of the most famous battles of the war. CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, author of "My Summer in a Garden," will describe Oriental Travel in his graphic and delightful style. CHARLES FRANCIS ADAMS, JR., a recognized authority on the subject, will treat ably and attractively of Railroad Matters in the many aspects in which they interest and affect the public. T. B. ALDRICH, fresh from a summer on the Continent, will contribute some sparkling sketches of European Travel. HENRY W. LONGFELLOW, JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES and JOHN G. WHITTIER, will continue to furnish their latest poetical productions to the public through the ATLANTIC. Poetry may also be expected from J. T. TROWBRIDGE, T. B. ALDRICH, Mrs. Thaxter, and other favorite writers. JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL, OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES, E. P. WHIPPLE, W. D. HOWELLS, JOHN FISKE, and other well known and competent scholars will contribute literary articles and essays. HENRY C. LEA, author of "Superstition and Force," has promised some valuable papers on Witchcraft. Questions of public interest will be discussed upon the plan originated by the ATLANTIC of having both sides presented independently by representative and authoritative writers. The magazine will present, as in the case of Free Trade, the opposite sides of the questions of Currency, Catholicism and State Education, Railroads, State and Municipal Debts, State Rights and Centralization, by the leading publicists of the country. The Departments of Recent Literature, Music, Art and Education, will be filled monthly, as heretofore, with able and vigorous editorial articles and reviews. TERMS: Single or specimen numbers, 35 cents. Yearly subscription, \$4.00, postage free.

CHRIST THE SOURCE OF SALVATION, By Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D.,
Professor of Systematic Theology, Theological Seminary,
Lancaster, Pa. Inquirer Printing and Publishing Company,
Lancaster, Pa., 1875.

This is a sermon preached by Dr. Gerhart, first in the First Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa., on the 14th of March, 1875, then by request in the Salem Reformed Church, Harrisburg, Pa., and finally before the Synod that convened in Lancaster in November last. It was designed to set forth in a popular style the principles of the theology taught in the Seminary at Lancaster, and may be regarded, therefore, as intended to supplement the two discourses delivered during the meeting of the Synod on the external and internal history of the Seminary.

It presents, first, Christ as the *Source* of salvation, as contrasted with any view which regards Him as merely the *means* or *agent*. He is the source as contrasted with the Bible. In the second place, He is the *original* source. Here the author diverges from Romanism, as well as from Calvinism and Arminianism. As against Romanism it is asserted that there is no vice-gerent of Christ who stand between Christ and His people. The communion is with His Church as a whole direct, which is his mystical body. According to Arminianism the will of man, or human freedom, is the turning-point in theology, and according to Calvinism the source of salvation is the divine decree. Over against these the sermon presents Jesus Christ as the original source of salvation.

In the *third* place Christ is the source of *free* salvation. It is free in that it is for all, without any reference to natural distinctions in the world. All have alike sinned, and no one merits salvation. It is a free gift to every one.

In the *fourth* place, Christ is the source of *certain* salvation. This brings up the question in regard to certitude. The Reformers, following St. Paul in the Scriptures, taught that man is justified by faith, and that Christ authenticates Himself directly to the believing heart, giving him assurance of salvation. The Roman Church had interposed *media* between the believer and Christ, the only assurance that could be given was that of the Church, and this assurance was not certain but only probable. The sermon aims to show the superiority of the Protestant faith here over the Roman Catholic.

The sermon as now published forms a neat little pamphlet, and is deserving of wide circulation especially among our people. It is worthy of this for its own sake. It presents a precious theme, and its treatment is well calculated to bring strength and comfort to the heart. But it is worthy of circulation also, because it furnishes light on the character of the theology taught in the Seminary.

It does not profess to speak with authority for the Seminary. The author was not appointed by Synod to present the character of the present teaching in the Seminary. It has simply the authority of one of the professors. But its value is perhaps all the greater because it is thus informal and free. Some will say it differs from the old Mercersburg system. There is a difference, all can feel that, but this is owing to the fact that certain points are not now emphasized as then. The principle here given is the same—Christ the source of salvation. We hope the sermon will receive a wide circulation.

"UNQUESTIONABLY THE BEST SUSTAINED WORK OF THE KIND IN THE WORLD."

HARPER'S MAGAZINE.

ILLUSTRATED.

Notices of the Press.

The ever-increasing circulation of this excellent monthly proves its continued adaptation to popular desires and needs. Indeed, when we think into how many homes it penetrates every month, we must consider it as one of the educators as well as entertainers of the public mind.—*Boston Globe*.

The character which this Magazine possesses for variety, enterprise, artistic wealth, and literary culture that has kept pace with, if it has not led the times, should cause its conductors to regard it with justifiable complacency. The Magazine has done good and not evil all the days of its life.—*Brooklyn Eagle*.

Some of the most popular of modern novels have first appeared as serials in this Magazine. In all respects, it is an excellent periodical, and fully deserves its great success.—*Philadelphia Ledger*.

TERMS:

Postage free to all Subscribers in the United States.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, one year \$4 00

\$4 00 includes prepayment of U. S. postage by the publishers.

Subscriptions to HARPER'S MAGAZINE, WEEKLY, and BAZAR, to one address for one year, \$10 00; or, two of Harper's Periodicals, to one address for one year, \$7 00: postage free.

An extra Copy of either the MAGAZINE, WEEKLY, or BAZAR will be supplied gratis for every Club of FIVE SUBSCRIBERS at \$4 00 each, in one remittance; or, Six Copies for \$20 00, without extra copy; postage free.

Back Numbers can be supplied at any time.

A Complete Set of HARPER'S MAGAZINE, now comprising 51 Volumes, in neat cloth binding, will be sent by express, freight at

expense of purchaser, for \$2 25 per volume. *Single volumes*, by mail *postpaid*, \$3 00. Cloth cases, for binding, 58 cents, by mail, *postpaid*.

A Complete Analytical Index to the first Fifty Volumes of HARPER'S MAGAZINE has just been published, rendering available for reference the vast and varied wealth of information which constitutes this periodical a perfect illustrated literary cyclopedia. 8vo. Cloth, \$3 00; Half Calf, \$5 25. Sent postage prepaid.

A series of papers under the title of "The First Century of the Republic," contributed by the most eminent American publicists, is now being published in HARPER'S MAGAZINE. This series of over twenty papers gives a comprehensive review of Progress during the century now closing, in every department of our national life.

Newspapers are not to copy this advertisement without the express order of HARPER & BROTHERS.

Address HARPER & BROTHERS, New York.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

The November and December ATLANTIC (containing the opening chapters of Mr. Howells' new story) will be sent free to all new subscribers for 1876 who remit the full subscription price of \$4.00 direct to the Publishers. For \$5.00 sent direct to them the Publishers will send the ATLANTIC through 1876, and a superb, life-size portrait of the poet Longfellow, just completed, and one of the finest pictures of the kind ever published. This portrait can be purchased only by subscribers to the ATLANTIC. Remittances by mail should be sent by a money-order, draft on New York or Boston, or registered letter to H. O. HOUGHTON & Co., Riverside Press, Cambridge, Mass. H. O. HOUGHTON & CO., Boston. HURD & HOUGHTON, New York.